

PROPHECY



and



THE WAR

By
THEODORE GRAEBNER

III

114
[REDACTED]

BS
647
.G67

Prophecy and the War.

"WAS IT FORETOLD?"



An Answer for Questioning Christians

by

TH. GRAEBNER,

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

6-92



66685

St. Louis, Mo.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1918.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE, N. Y. 10708



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EHD-871

A Russellite, Mr. Rutherford of New York, lectured at the Odéon to-day. His theme was: "The War and Its Relation to the End of the World." The Odéon is our largest concert-hall. Every seat was occupied when Mr. Rutherford began his lecture, and all remained to hear him to the end.

In the "Christian Herald," Dr. Gray of Moody Institute has written a series of articles on the Thousand-year Reign of Christ and its relation to the War. The publisher now announces a second series, because so much interest was aroused by the first that the office of the paper was "deluged with letters."

Five or six persons have sent me newspaper clippings that contain a reference to the restoration of Mesopotamia by the English as a producer of wheat, and have asked whether this is not a fulfilment of prophecy. Others believe that it will not be because the land is forever cursed.

Brother Johannes's prophecy, dated 1600, and referring to the war of the leopard, the eagles, and the cock, has been reprinted in the newspapers of the United States and Canada ever since it appeared, in 1914, in the Paris "Figaro."

This seems to be a live subject.

Let us investigate it in the light of Scripture, history, and common sense.

TH. GRAEBNER.

December 2, 1917.

St. Louis, Missouri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Chapter 1.— Prediction and Prophecy	5
Chapter 2.— Israel's Restoration and the War	22
Chapter 3.— The Millennium	38
Chapter 4.— Gog and Magog	46
Chapter 5.— The Days and Years of Prophecy	74
Chapter 6.— How to Read Prophecy	100

Chapter 1. — Prediction and Prophecy.

Has it been foretold?

Has the finger of prophecy pointed at the great World Conflict, now in its fourth year, and showing no abatement? Has the war been foretold?

The interest in this question is world-wide. As soon as the first stupor, caused by the fearful suddenness of the catastrophe, had passed away, men began to question: Might we not have known that it was coming? And others asserted with much confidence: You might have known full well, because the prophecies were clear enough if you had been willing to heed them.

One man said: "I have told you so. I have prophesied this war, and I have foretold the year: 1914." That man was "Pastor" Russell. However, this claim is not supported by the facts. What Russell did foretell for the year 1914 was quite the reverse. Not a universal clash of arms, but the ushering in of the Millennium, the establishment of Christ's visible kingdom, the annihilation of Satan. Now, if anything is clear, it is this, that Satan was not annihilated in 1914, that Christ did not gather the resurrected saints to reign with Him in glory on earth, that the Millennium did not come.

But if "Pastor" Russell did not foretell the war, there were others who did.

Some twelve years ago Queen Alexandra of Great Britain said: "I have always distrusted warlike preparations of which nations never seem to tire. Some day this accumulated material will burst into flames." ¹⁾

Three years later Mr. Asquith uttered equally solemn words: "These things are intended to be used. They do not exist for ornament and display. At some moment, by

1) *Advocate of Peace*, 1905, p. 99.

the sudden outburst of an accidental fit of passion or temper, they will be let loose upon the world.”²⁾ That was in 1908.

In 1911 there was published in the Paris periodical *La Guerre Social* an article by Francis Delaisi, member of the Chamber of Deputies, entitled, “La Guerre qui Vient” — “The Coming War.” From this article I quote the following significant statements:—

“A conflict is preparing itself, compared with which the horrible slaughter of the Russo-Japanese war will be child’s play.”

“In 1914 the [naval] forces of England and Germany will be almost equal.”

“A Prussian army corps will advance with forced marches to occupy Antwerp.”

“We, the French, will have to do the fighting on the Belgian plains.”

“All newspapers will print in headlines as large as your hand these prophetic words: THE BELGIAN NEUTRALITY HAS BEEN VIOLATED. THE PRUSSIAN ARMY IS MARCHING UPON LILLE.”

How accurately these prognostications have been fulfilled need not be pointed out. But have we here a “prophecy,” pointing to the great world-struggle? Let us distinguish carefully between prognostications, or forecasts, and prophecy. The forecasts of our Weather Bureau are not prophecies. Astronomers may very accurately foretell eclipses of the sun or moon, yet they are not prophets. The previsions of Queen Alexandra and of Lord Asquith were not prophecies. They were deductions from patent facts, pointing to inevitable conclusions. M. F. Delaisi discusses at great length the diplomatic situation, and from his knowledge of international diplomacy, especially from the inside history of the famous *entente cordiale* concluded between the statesmen of France and England in 1903, he draws the conclusion: “A terrible war between England and Germany is preparing.”

2) *Report of the Seventeenth Universal Peace Congress*, London, 1908, p. 210.

Without expressing an opinion on the validity of M. Delaisi's premises, it is quite evident that his predictions, so accurately fulfilled, were simple deductions from known physical and economic laws, and in no wise can be termed "prophecy."

"PREDICTIONS."

Let us keep this distinction in mind as we proceed to sift another class of evidence. Some ten or twelve years ago Count Leo Tolstoy gave an interview, in the course of which he predicted a great conflict to flare up in the South-east of Europe. His prediction is veiled in imagery. He "sees floating on the sea of fate the huge silhouette of a woman." This woman stands for "Greed." "Destruction and agony follow in her wake." "The great conflagration will start about 1912, in the countries of southeastern Europe. It will result in a destructive calamity in 1913. In that year I see all Europe in flames and bleeding. I hear the lamentations of huge battlefields. About the year 1916 a strange figure from the North — a new Napoleon — enters the stage of the bloody drama. He is a man of little military training, a writer or a journalist, but in his grip most of Europe will remain until 1925. There will be left no empires or kingdoms, but the world will form a Federation of the United States of the World."

This was intended as a "prediction," in the specific sense of the word. It is not a rational calculation, but is cast in the form of a vision. It *assumes* supernatural insight on the part of the prognosticator. But if supernatural, then why does it fail in such essential features as the year in which the conflagration is to begin, and the coming of a new Napoleon in 1916? The war broke out in 1914, and not in 1912 or 1913. The mysterious Man from the North has not come. Evidently, if at all genuine, this "prediction" of Tolstoy's is another shrewd deduction from the political situation as it was developing at the time. The expectation has been universal for some thirty years or more that the Balkan situation would yet lead to a great European conflict. As a prophecy, even as a prediction, this fancy of Tolstoy's

must be ruled out. It may be pure invention, although it seems well authenticated.

Soon after hostilities commenced, the superstitious in all countries delved deeply into the oracular sayings of such "prophets" as Nostradamus (died 1556) and of Mme. Lenormand, who died in 1843. But the results of these investigations are zero.

Nostradamus³⁾ characterized the year 1913 as a "year of peril," a pretty safe prediction, since to some nation somewhere any year is a year of "peril." And the war did not come in 1913.

Mme. Lenormand is said to have predicted that the successors of Emperor William I were to reign until 1913. It is now 1917, and William II still is ruler.

Strangely enough, these "prophets" and "prophetesses" always predict good fortune to the country in which they are citizens, and in this respect their method resembles that of the charlatans who interpret the dreams of the credulous in some American newspapers. A good instance in point is the "prophecy" of "Brother Johannes," which has received much publicity since it was first printed in the Paris *Figaro* late in 1914. "Brother Johannes" is supposed to have been a monk who lived in 1600. As his prophecy may stand as a type of many others which have received currency of late, I shall reprint it entire. "Brother John" is quoted as foretelling the rise and downfall of Antichrist in a great European conflict:—

"The real Antichrist will be one of the monarchs of his time, a Lutheran Protestant. He will invoke God and give himself out as his Messenger (or apostle).

"This prince of lies will swear by the Bible. He will represent himself as the arm of the Most High, sent to chastise corrupt peoples. He will only have one arm, but his innumerable armies, who will take for their device the

3) The book of this charlatan "is a collection of unmeaning nonsense, words, words, words, of doubtful manufacture and more dubious meaning, which scarcely rattle as they fall." (*McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia*, Vol. VII, p. 198.)

words, 'God with us,' will resemble the infernal legions. For a long time he will act by craft and strategy. His spies will overrun the earth, and he will be master of the secrets of the mighty. He will have learned men in his pay, who will maintain, and undertake to prove, his celestial mission. A war will furnish him with the opportunity of throwing off the mask. It will not be in the first instance a war which he will wage against a French monarch. But it will be one of such a nature that after two weeks all will realize its universal character.

"Not only all Christians and all Mussulmans, but even other, more distant peoples will be involved. Armies will be enrolled from the four quarters of the globe. For by the third week the angels will have opened the minds of men, who will perceive that the man is Antichrist, and that they will all become his slaves if they do not overthrow this conqueror.

"Antichrist will be recognized by various tokens; in especial he will massacre the priests, the monks, the women, the children, and the aged. He will show no mercy, but will pass, torch in hand, like the barbarians, but invoking Christ! His words of imposture will resemble those of Christians, but his actions will be those of Nero and of the Roman persecutors. He will have an eagle in his arms, and there will be an eagle also in the arms of his confederate, another bad monarch.

"In order to conquer Antichrist, it will be necessary to kill more men than Rome has ever contained. It will need the energies of all the kingdoms, because the cock, the leopard, and the white eagle will not be able to make an end of the black eagle without the aid of the prayers and vows of all the human race. Never will humanity have been faced with such a peril, because the triumph of Antichrist would be that of the demon, who will have taken possession of his personality.

"The black eagle, who will come from the land of Luther, will make a surprise attack on the cock from another side, and will invade the land of the cock up to one-half.

“The white eagle, who will come from the North, will fall upon the black and the other eagle, and completely invade the land of Antichrist.

“The black eagle will find itself forced to let go the cock in order to fight the white eagle, whereupon the cock will have to pursue the black eagle into the land of Antichrist to aid the white eagle.

“The battles fought up to that time will be as nothing compared with those which will take place in the Lutheran country; for the seven angels will simultaneously pour out the fire of their censers upon the impious land. In other words, the Lamb ordains the extermination of the race of Antichrist. Men will be able to cross the rivers over the bodies of the dead, which in places will change the courses of the streams. Only the bodies of the most noble, the highest captains and the princes, will be buried; for to the carnage of the battlefields will be added the destruction of myriads who will die from hunger and pestilence.

“It will be made manifest that the combat, to be fought out in that part of the country in which Antichrist forges his arms, is no human conflict. The three animals, defenders of the Lamb, will exterminate the last army of Antichrist. But it will be necessary to make of the field of battle a funeral pyre as great as the greatest of cities, for the corpses will have altered the features of the land by forming ranges of little hills.

“Antichrist will lose his crown and die in solitude and madness. His empire will be divided into twenty-two states, but none will have any longer either fortification or army, or ships of war.

“The white eagle, by order of Michael, will drive the Crescent out of Europe, where there will be no longer any but Christians. He will install himself at Constantinople.

“Then will commence an era of peace and prosperity for the universe, and there will be no longer any war. Each nation will be governed according to its own heart, and live in accordance with justice.

“There will no longer be Lutherans or schismatics. The

Lamb will reign, and the supreme happiness of humanity will begin. Happy will be those who, escaping the perils of that period, will be able to enjoy the fruit of the reign of the Spirit and of the purging of humanity, which can only come after the defeat of the Antichrist."

All this, of course, is not a genuine "prediction," but the invention of an imaginative Parisian journalist, who confidently expected the "white eagle" (Russia), the "cock" (France), by the aid of the "leopard" (England), to "completely invade the land of Antichrist" (Germany), there to fight the decisive battles of the war. The prediction is couched in terms calculated to appeal to a Roman Catholic community. It was first published in November, 1914.

However, the credulous and superstitious are not confined to France. Germany, too, was apprised of certain mysterious utterances of men and women gifted with the "second sight." And these oracular sayings were invariably construed to signify success to the German arms.

In December, 1914, the *Neue Metaphysische Rundschau*, a periodical which caters to spiritism, astrology, and similar forms of semiscientific superstition, reprinted a prediction of the year 1688 (?) which is interpreted to mean that England will be defeated by a Wilhelm in 1914. But England is now, December, 1917, still in the ring. We suspect that this "prediction," too, was written some time in 1914.

In 1915 the Orania-Verlag (Oranienburg) published a brochure by Reinh. Gerling entitled, *Der Weltkrieg 1914—1915 im Lichte der Prophezeiung*. The book contains a great number of so-called predictions, but none of them will be accepted as relevant by the judicious. They are either so indefinite as to permit of almost any interpretation, or they assume conditions which do not obtain in our age. For instance: None of these "prophets" was able to foresee the fact that open warfare would give way to trench-warfare in the present development of military art. Hence they all fail in their predictions of "decisive battles." Any one of twenty engagements of the present conflict might be termed "decisive," so huge have the theaters of war become. The

famous prediction of the "Schlacht am Birkenbaeumchen," the "battle at the birch-tree," cannot refer to the present war for this reason, if for no other. Battles in this war are not fought at a birch-tree, but involve the onset of hundreds of thousands on fifty-mile fronts. The author of the brochure referred to gives the full text of the various "birch-tree" prophecies, but admits that they do not contain any elements which can be construed as a prophecy of the Great War. However, he believes that the Parisian fortune-teller Mme. de Thebes foretold the murder of Archduke Francis Ferdinand (which precipitated the war) and the accession of Emperor Karl of Austria, when she wrote, November, 1912: "*He who believes that he will reign, will not reign; a young man will rule who should not yet rule.*" Unfortunately, however, the prophetess failed to specify to which country she had reference, and in which year the dynastic change was to come. If ten years hence a similar turn of fortune should put a young Chinaman on the throne of the Yellow Kingdom, occultists everywhere would again be justified in saying that Mme. de Thebes's prophecy "had come true." Besides, in December, 1914, this same pseudo-prophetess foretold for 1915 that the war would be over between March and July, that the Hohenzollern house would then cease to reign in Germany, and that in Paris there would be "triumphal arches." She also foretold civil war in Germany for the same year. All these predictions failed.

Gerling quotes (p. 20) from Frau de Ferriem's book, *My Intuitions* ("Mein geistiges Schauen"), printed in 1905, the following: "Yes, I see it coming, the inevitable war! There will be some delay. Years, quite a number of years, will pass. But then there will be a sudden onslaught, with elemental force. There will be bitter fighting, more so than in '71. That was mere play by comparison. Sad years are coming, but *we* will conquer, *WE* will! Not because we are Germans; no, the spirits of our forefathers will help us win. Their roots will bring forth new shoots, though our enemies thought they were dried up. The seed will bring a rich harvest." Again, does this deserve the name of prediction?

No more is said here than Queen Alexandra, without occult frills, expressed by saying: "Some day this accumulated material will burst into flames." Nor did it require a prophet to foretell that the next war would see terrible fighting. The advance in ammunition-making, the invention of the quick-firers, the discovery of melinite and picrite made that certain. As for the aid of the departed ancestors, that was pure "bunk," intended for the consumption of the superstitious.

Zadkiel's Almanac, an occult year-book, is next quoted by Herr Gerling as having made this prediction in 1911: "George V will die by the same death as his brother, and during his reign there will be severe catastrophes on water and on land." Once more: who of us could not predict "catastrophes" for any country, to occur in any year? That is what the American calls a "safe bet." "Accidents will happen." For the death of King George no date is mentioned. *Nous verrons que nous verrons.*

General Gordon is reported (p. 33) to have said in 1882: "I foresee that England will not be embroiled with any neighbor within the next twenty-five years. But about the year 1910 a neighboring power will arise against mighty England. If this power will be victorious, England will lose her preponderance on land and sea and be shorn of her colonies." Comparing this with the essay of the French politician Delaisi, who made no claim to preternatural power, as is claimed for General Gordon by Gerling, we cannot help but note that a knowledge of international diplomacy permitted the Frenchman to foretell the impending conflict with much greater accuracy than General Gordon. Doubtless, Gordon based his assertion on his knowledge of the naval construction program upon which Germany had entered about that time. He knew, as did every close observer, that "These things are intended *to be used*" (Asquith, as quoted).

But why continue? Every "prophecy" contained in Gerling's book upon close scrutiny resolves itself into vague conjectures, based upon the political situation, or, if more ancient, completely fails to rise to the dignity even of a good guess. The book is palpably a sop to the superstitious, whose

confidence in the ultimate victory of Germany needed bolstering up.

Of predictions concerning the war originating in the United States, I have been able to find, as the nearest approach, only the following, clipped some years ago from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, and accommodately turning up as this chapter is in preparation:

"Pittsburgh, Pa., Sept. 3. (Special.) — The seventeen-year locust, with a 'W' on the wings, has come back. A bloody war will be the result, and will take place within five years, according to the prediction to-day of Horatio Markham, the Pittsburgh hermit, who foretold the Spanish-American War."

Granted that this prognostication was made no earlier than 1909, — the writer failed to note the year when making this clipping, — it does not satisfy the requirements of a genuine prediction even in that case. Wars are generally "bloody," and there has not been a year during the past century when there was not some armed conflict somewhere on the globe. The prediction might safely be made also in years when there are no "W"-locusts. Whether the Spanish-American War was "predicted" by the Pittsburgh hermit, we have no means of ascertaining.

Casting up the result of our investigation, it seems a justifiable conclusion to say that the material examined up to this point contains several well-authenticated *prognostications* (based on a knowledge of political conditions), some plain *fiction*, in which the wish was father to the thought, and no *predictions* in the proper sense. As to whether there *can be* such knowledge of coming events, derived from occult powers resident in the human mind, that abstract question does not concern us now. As regards the present case, *i. e.*, the Great War, the evidence is distinctly negative.

FOREKNOWLEDGE POSSIBLE.

Does the writer, then, intend to rule out as non-admissible any assumption that there might have been some prophetic foreknowledge of the war? There is no such intention. Without question, the possibility of actual prediction must

be upheld, also as regards the present world-conflict. Only those who deny offhand the supernatural element in human life will sustain the counter-proposition. The Bible, our inerrant guide, plainly teaches that there is such a thing as supernatural foreknowledge of future events. And such foreknowledge is twofold: it originates with God, or it originates with the devil. The Book of Acts records the instance of "a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination" (Acts 16, 16 ff.). Even in the days of Moses, Satan had his agents among the heathen, who were endowed with powers of necromancy, foretelling of days, and divination, and who are denounced by Moses as in a special sense "an abomination before the Lord" (Deut. 18, 10 f.). Such diviners were especially drawn to the courts of ancient rulers, where their powers were consulted in matters of state. The magicians at the court of Pharaoh and later at the court of Nebuchadnezzar are a familiar instance. Nor do the Scriptures assert that in the "latter days," in the Gospel-age, there would be a cessation of such manifestations of diabolical power. However, the Scriptures sharply distinguish between divination and *prophecy*. Of true prophecy, divination is a Satanic caricature, as it was in the days when Moses and Aaron stood against Jannes and Jambres in the palace of Pharaoh. Prophecy is of God. Both in the old dispensation and in the early days of the Christian era, God made known future events through His chosen agents. Immediately after warning His people against the diviners of heathen Canaan, Moses steps forth as a prophet of the Most High, and announces the coming of "a Prophet like unto himself," unto whom Israel shall hearken. With ever increasing clearness and definition the coming of the Messiah is foretold by the prophets of the Old Covenant. Indeed, their pointing to Christ and His Kingdom of Grace is the heart and kernel of their message. Not only the Savior and His Kingdom of Grace, but also the rise and fall of empires which was to precede the coming of the Redeemer, and the struggles of the Church in a later world-age, are pictured in broad outlines upon the prophetic

scroll. The succession of earthly empires, — the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek (Macedonian), the Roman, — the rise of the papacy and its decline, as well as the troubles and sorrows which are to come upon the Christian Church in the time before the end, have been announced in the sacred writings by prophetic inspiration.

These prophecies have ever been, as they were intended to be, a matter of great significance to the faithful children of God. They are the clock to which they turn in order to ascertain the age in which they live. By the succession of monarchies in the Old Testament age, ticked off by the great clock of prophecy, they were able to note with rejoicing the approach of the Messianic kingdom. No doubt, it was by such close study of the prophecies that the Magi knew the time of Christ's birth to be at hand. Nor can we doubt that the risen Savior, on the way to Emmaus, when He "expounded unto them in *all* the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," pointed out the fulfilment also of the time and times set by prophecy, even as He had forewarned His disciples on the Mount of Olives that the things spoken of by Daniel concerning the Abomination of Desolation must shortly come to pass. From prophecy we know that we are now living in the last era of the world's history. The clock now points to the eleventh hour. As the years and months pass, her hands are approaching ever closer to the hour of Christ's return in glory for the final judgment of the living and the dead.

However, there have ever been, and there are to-day, inquisitive Christians who desire more specific information than this, and who believe that the prophecies, when closely studied and properly understood, can be made to furnish such specific statements, also concerning the days in which they live. It is a well-known fact that many false prophets of our age have found this attitude of many believing Christians a receptive field for the seeds of false teachings. Upon the symbolical numbers, especially in Daniel and Revelation, they rear an edifice of speculation which is sometimes so well buttressed with apparently faultless

chronological calculations that many unwary Christians are led, by this well-paved highway, into the morass of superstition and unbelief. Seventh-day Adventism is an unchristian cult, which has won many an adherent by just such "convincing," even "unanswerable" arguments based on Scriptural prophecy. In 1843 Adventist farmers did not till their fields because their prophet Miller proclaimed the end of the world for that year. When his prediction failed, he foretold the Judgment again for 1844, and since then, successively, Adventist prophets have set 1845, 1850, 1857, 1863, 1877, 1896, and later dates as the beginning of the Millennium. It is an amazing fact, and proves the strength of Chiliastic delusion, that, in spite of these ignominious defeats, Seventh-day Adventism still counts its adherents by tens of thousands. Ten years ago a wave of Millennial Dawn swept the country. Thousands of Christians accepted the calculations of "Pastor" Russell, and became convinced that the reign of Christ was to begin in 1914. Mainly through the Chiliastic pronouncements of this arch-deceiver they were drawn into a system which denies the cardinal truths of Christianity.

Soon after the great war broke in 1914, there was a new delving into the symbolism of Daniel, Ezekiel, and of the Revelation of John, and soon the announcement was made by several investigators: **IT HAS BEEN FORETOLD.** Immediately thousands of Bible Christians became interested. Immediately, too, others set to work on Gog and Magog, Armageddon, the Seventy Weeks, 666, 1,260, etc., and soon religious periodicals, in this country and abroad, contained the message, announced with greater or less assurance, **IT HAS BEEN FORETOLD.** Pamphlets and tracts appeared, promulgating the same message, and now several books are on the market, running to 350 pages each, which not only contain most circumstantial "proof" for this assertion, but announce likewise the exact time when the war will come to a close, who will be the victor, and the significance of the war for the Christian Church, now (it is said) about to enter into her millennial period.

WHAT DOES IT MATTER?

One might well ask, But what is the difference? Granted that these people are all wrong, will it matter greatly whether they engage the attention of Christian readers while this war is raging? Will they not lead people to study the Bible anew? If they are wrong in setting the date of the war's conclusion, if victory will not come as prognosticated, and if the predictions fail in other details, who will be the worse for it?

Answer: A great many people will be the worse for it. Reference has been made to "Pastor" Russell and his "Millennial Dawn." His predictions for 1914 failed most signally. The reverse of that happened which he foretold. Yet his deluded followers are as much infatuated with "Millennial Dawn" as the Millerites (Adventists) were after the sixth, seventh, and tenth setting of dates for Judgment Day had failed. Mrs. Ellen White was to the day of her death revered as a true prophetess. Just now both the Russellites and the Seventh-day Adventists are once more engaged in an energetic propaganda for their religious views. Their trump-card now is their interpretation of the World-war in the light of prophecy. Tens of thousands of Christians in all denominations are being proselytized. There is danger that the entire Christian world will be burned over by the fires of a new Chiliastic fanaticism.

And this setting of dates and the prognostications of the outcome of the war have begun to muddle the brains of Christians also outside the Adventist and Russellite sphere of influence. Reputable church-papers have given much space in recent months to articles on prophecy and the war. The positive assertion is heard on all sides, **IT HAS BEEN FORETOLD**, thus and thus it will end, then will come the battle of Armageddon, the Jews will be converted, and Christ will reign in glory on earth with His saints for a thousand years. Antichrist will be abolished in 1926. The Turk will be destroyed in 1927. The Gentile nations will fall in 1934. The Millennium will come in 1972. By the seeming accuracy of the figuring with which these

dates are supported, many Christians are becoming restless and ask: May there not be some truth in this, after all? How these figures do agree! How accurately the Scriptures are being fulfilled! Are we blind that we have not seen this? And is not the true faith to be found where such power of the Spirit is being manifested?

The symptoms are multiplying that Christian people in all denominations are taking an interest in the claims of modern "time-setters," which is far from healthy. As often as the pretensions of Chiliastic speculation succeed in taking root in the Church, a strange, fanatical bigotry begins to manifest itself. People "go daft" on the Seventy Weeks and on other symbolical numbers. All their religious thinking is contracted upon this one point. They do not see or hear anything else; their mind is absorbed in this one subject; they have become religious paranoiacs, monomaniacs. And there is also in religious pathology such a thing as mass-insanity. As in the Middle Ages thousands of people were simultaneously seized by an insane impetus to worship at the Holy Blood or to drive the Turk from Palestine, so there is a subtle infection at work whenever Chiliasm gets a new hold on Christian communities. "Time-setting" epidemics have during the nineteenth century killed the germs of faith in thousands of hearts. This potent virus of Chiliasm is working even now in the body of Protestantism. Bible Christians are not very apt to be disturbed by the claims of professional fortune-tellers, dead or alive; the predictions of a Nostradamus, of a Mme. Lenormand, or a Mme. de Thebes will find them only mildly interested. At most, if such predictions come true, they accept them as workings of Satanic power. But when Satan comes as an Angel of Light, employing the sacred Scripture, and asserting exalted powers of interpretation and insight; when the prophecies of the Sacred Writers are made to yield promises of a glorious Millennium, due when the Great War has come to a close, he does not fail to addle the brains of many Christians. The danger is surely not to be underestimated when viewed in the light of church history, and it is rising higher with every passing month.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WAR.

But is it not possible, after all, that the Scriptures do contain references to this great conflict? Yes, is there not a presumption in favor of the surmise that so great and universal a clash of nations is mirrored in ancient prophecy?

No doubt, there is something to be said in favor of such a supposition. It is true that the present struggle is in more than one respect the most appalling conflict of the ages. One writer declares that this war seems "like some infernal dream devised by the imps of hell sitting in an eternity of inventive council." What fearful new engines of destruction have entered into the armament of modern warfare! Asphyxiating gases, the submarine, air-craft dropping deadly missiles upon undefended towns, the British armored car. We have become accustomed to the reports of daily agonies of entire populations. More than a billion people are engaged in this war; some ten million have been slain in battle. The cost in money mounts into such figures that no human mind is able to comprehend them; it is now more than one hundred million dollars a day. Our very lives have undergone a radical change. We can now barely imagine the world as it was before the war. Professor Ferrero, the Italian historian, says: "The Europe in which we were born has in great part crumbled away since August 1, 1914. Everything has been upheaved, suspended, overturned, destroyed." "The faculty of wonder has been dulled," says Winston Spencer Churchill. "The world is in twilight; and from beyond dim flickering horizons comes tirelessly the thudding of guns." (*Current History*, Oct., 1916.) The editor of *Life* (Australia) observes: "The great war grows in scale and significance as each day passes. It is plainly the 'war of all the centuries.' The war will not only give the world a new map; it will give to civilized history a new date, and perhaps a new form." And Nicholas Murray Butler says: "The cataclysm is so awful that it is quite within the bounds of truth to say that on July 31, 1914, the curtain went down upon a world which will never be seen again." Similarly Prince Lvoff: "This war has separated the past

from the present by a heavy curtain. Whenever and however it may come to an end, it is clear that we are through with the old order of things, and a new one will have to take its place.”⁴⁾ That so stupendous a conflict, the greatest the world has ever seen, involving a crash of dynasties, a destruction of values, and an amount of human misery such as has never before been recorded in the same space of time, is important enough to have been pointed at by the finger of prophecy, cannot be denied. If the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews, one might ask, have been foretold, then why not this destruction of a thousand cities and the overturn of an entire world-order?

We may go a step farther and confidently assert that we are indeed viewing to-day the fulfilment of more than one word of prophecy. The destruction of Jerusalem is foretold by our Savior as a type of the sorrows in the last world-age. Millions have again experienced since 1914 what our Lord spoke concerning the population of the Holy Land when the judgment of God should come upon it: In Armenia, Greece, Serbia, and elsewhere on three continents men have “fled into the mountains”; in Belgium, Poland, Galicia, Italy, millions have “not come down from the housetops to take anything out of the house,” neither did they that “were in the field return back to take their clothes.” A million times it has come true: “Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!” “Nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in divers places.” Who that reads these predictions of our Lord in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew and in the thirteenth chapter of Mark can fail to realize that the last days are at hand? Surely, the Great War is one of the signs which were to make known to the believers in Christ the approaching consummation of all things, the End of the World.

4) Quotations from Arthur G. Daniells' *The World War; Its Relation to the Eastern Question*.

On this point all Christians, I believe, are agreed. But there are many who believe, and a vast literature has been issued in the last two or three years to prove, that the Scriptural references to the age in which we now live are far more specific than this. Not only are the sorrows and afflictions which the Great War has brought in its wake, the "distress and perplexity of nations, men's hearts failing them for fear" (Luke 21), a sign of the coming Judgment, but, so we are told, the war itself and its issues have been foretold by Ezekiel, Daniel, and John. These claims must now engage our attention.

A preliminary survey of the "war-and-prophecy" literature reveals several outstanding facts:

1) A direct bearing of prophecy upon the war has been established upon the twofold hypothesis of

The Restoration and Conversion of the Jewish Race, and
The Millennium, or Christ's visible reign of one thousand years before the end of the world.

If either of these suppositions is shown to be without warrant in the Scriptures, the case falls to the ground.

2) Attempts have been made to demonstrate arithmetically the relevancy of certain numbers found in prophecy to the present conflict and to its bearing upon the inauguration of Christ's reign on earth (the Millennium). If these calculations are based upon false assumptions, or if they fail in mathematical exactness, the interpretations based upon them are again proven false.

Chapter 2.

Israel's Restoration and the War.

The *Presbyterian* (Philadelphia) for September 20, 1917, contained an article by the Rev. Edwin J. Reinke, entitled, "The Tolling of the Signal Bell." Rev. Reinke says in part: "There are now transpiring in the Levant events so solemn and momentous as to demand the most earnest consideration of all who fear God and still hold fast belief in His unerring

Word. Jehovah's signal-bell is tolling. For unless all signs fail, the next two years (if not the next few months) will witness the most epochal happening since the day of the Ascension. The reference is to the establishment of an independent Jewish state. The world's attention has been so engrossed with the thunder of the Western captains, that the shadows of the nearing events in the East have been mostly unnoticed. Yet not only has Bagdad fallen before the advancing British bayonets, the *Drang nach Osten* meeting the grim determination of the victors of Waterloo, but British troops are closing in on Palestine. While detailed information is still lacking, it is certain that Gaza has fallen, that the objective is Jerusalem, and that, were heavy artillery to be employed, in disregard of the sanctities of the Holy City, it would not be long before the Crescent would be hauled down, to be replaced by the Union Jack. At any rate, that the red-coat bull-dog is not going to relax his grip is certain. That Turkey, with the surrender of the Central Powers, would virtually disappear from the map, is also assured. In either case, what disposition is going to be made of Palestine? On all hands it is now agreed that a Jewish state, under the protection of either England, France, or America, will be established. Russia, the only power that might have objected, will now have no voice in the settlement. In England the subject is no longer considered, it would seem, debatable, and the voice of England will assuredly prevail. The Jews, who have suffered even more grievously in the Great War than when the Roman Eagles flew across the smoking ruins of the Holy City, are now eagerly looking towards the fanes of their fathers. A Zionist banner is already in existence, and the vast resources of the Children of Abraham will warrant the stupendous undertaking of a national restoration, desert though the Pleasant Land may be.

"One of the most remarkable of our Lord's prophecies is Luke 21, 34: 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.' The erection of a Jewish state would therefore be equivalent to

the declaration of Christ Himself that the times of the Gentiles have expired. What is the significance of this, what therefore the duty of the hour?

“The closing of the Times of the Gentiles and the restoration of the Jewish people involve the setting up of the Messianic kingdom in its glory form.

“Let us take heed to the sounding of the Jewish tocsin. With the reestablishment of a Jewish state a large amount of Biblical interpretation will be automatically ruled out — outlawed by the necessities of the case. Undoubtedly there ought to be called a convocation of evangelical teachers of all shades of opinion. In the light of fulfilled prophecy, might not a Protestant ecumenical deliverance be possible? Should we not need the clearest light for the times that were seen to be coming?

“Without spending our strength on attempting detailed programs of coming events, we nevertheless urgently need to realize that the Lord is at the doors, and that we ought to attend to the practical duty of preparing ourselves by prayer, repentance, and renewed consecration for the Great Appearing. The end may not be immediately. Prophetic periods have often lengthened out before. They may do so again. But the end may also be at hand. It looks as though it hastened greatly. It is a time of deep solemnity.”

This is a comparatively sane statement of the hopes which some Christians in our day attach to the events developing in the Near East. The author of this article believes that there is warrant for the belief that Christ's Reign in Glory is approaching because “the time of the Gentiles” is being fulfilled. This hope is based upon the correctness of each of these assumptions:—

1) That the Jewish race will be restored, in the sense that Israel will again be gathered as a nation to live in the land of their fathers.

2) That this “restoration of Israel” signifies the end of “the time of the Gentiles” and the approach of the Second Advent.

A German Baptist paper, the *Sendbote*, of September 8,

1915, contained an article by C. F. Dallmus, from which we quote the following in translation:—

“A subject of Bible prophecy which in any event will be touched very deeply by the present war, is the gathering and return of Israel and the founding of a Jewish state in the land of their fathers. The Zionist movement is a finger which points in that direction. The *London Evening Mail* said November 24, 1914: ‘It is clear that the war will have a decisive influence upon the prospects of Zionism. Whatever the outcome of the war, the return of the Jews to Palestine will receive support. If the Allies win, British or French influence would predominate in Syria, and the influence of either would favor the erection of a Jewish state in that continent. A victory of Germany would secure the position of Turkey, and the idea of giving the Jews autonomy in Palestine would no doubt receive German support because of the loyalty which the Jews have shown in this war.’ In the higher politics of God the entry of Turkey into the world war was not an accident. The prophetic word clearly demonstrates that the final solution of the great world-problems is inseparably bound up with the restoration and gathering of Israel into the ancient land of promise, first in unbelief, then for the final sifting and testing through the last, great, cruel Antichrist, who will probably come out of the Turkish Empire.”

This Baptist writer, then, essentially agrees with the *Presbyterian* quoted above. Upon the supposition that the ingathering of the Jews in Palestine and their restoration as a nation will introduce the last world-age, the issue of the conflict in the Near East and its immediate effects upon the fortunes of the Jewish race are regarded as highly significant as a preparation for the fulfilment of prophecy.

During the present year (1917) the Methodist paper, *Der Christliche Apologete*, contained a series of articles entitled, “The Last Great Struggle of the Nations and Its Relation to the Present European War.” The author, Rev. I. I. Hoffmann, attempts a much more definite prediction of the events which may be expected to follow the termination of

the great conflict now raging. While disclaiming positive assurance, Rev. Hoffmann believes that "on the basis of prophecy we may expect the development of European affairs to proceed about along the following lines: The European conflict is taking place in the territory of the ancient Roman Empire, and almost all the nations which made up the ancient empire have been drawn into the struggle." Here we must interrupt our author. In a previous article he has pointed out the fact that the following nations now correspond to the ten kingdoms which, according to the prophet Daniel, were to issue from the Roman Empire upon its dissolution: England, Scotland, France, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. But, we ask, is Scotland a separate "nation"? Why is Greece excluded from the roster? Why Austria, of which the greater part was parcel of the Roman Empire? Is it because the number "ten" must be obtained in order to fit into prophecy? Why is Germany included, which never was under Roman dominion? And do Holland, Spain, and Switzerland belong to the theater of war? Besides, is it not plainly foretold that the ten nations referred to in Daniel will be in existence before Antichrist comes (Dan. 7, 24 ff.)? Our author says that in every world-age there will be ten kingdoms corresponding to the ten which followed upon the Roman Empire. *Where is the proof?* Again: Are there not armed conflicts in East Africa, in the Baltic Provinces of Russia? The Roman Empire never extended to these parts of the world. Nor did it extend to East Prussia, nor to Poland, nor to Galicia, which have witnessed such terrific fighting. And now, most important of all, the United States have entered the conflict. How does this fit into the author's interpretation? We have bare assertion here without a particle of proof. But to return to our article.

Rev. Hoffmann continues: "The final result of this great ferment of nations will be the complete reconstruction and reorganization of the ancient world-monarchy, with Rome as the capital. That monarch who will succeed in interesting for his diplomacy the financial power of the world will hold

out longest in the final struggle and will remain victor. Now, who is it that controls the money markets of the world? The Jews. Hence, whoever would remain conqueror in the final world-struggle must depend upon the Jewish financiers. In return, he must give certain privileges to the Jews. He will guarantee to the Jews their liberty, their return to the Holy Land, their restoration as a nation, the rebuilding of the temple, and protection against foreign enemies." Upon their return to the Holy Land the pious Jews will be cruelly persecuted, but "Jehovah will then summon another king to chastise Israel. Like a thundercloud the Czar (!) and his allies will invade and destroy the country. The coming of Christ is then close at hand. The Millennium will be inaugurated, Jerusalem will become the capital of the world, and the Jewish nation will at last be converted to its Messiah-King."

How does the author arrive at these astonishing conclusions? We cannot reproduce his entire argument, but the following samples will, I believe, satisfy the inquisitiveness of most readers. Paul speaks of the "man of sin," who will "exalt himself above God." Rev. Hoffmann says this is a false Messiah, who will mislead many Jews when they are gathered in the land of their fathers. After the work of this arch-deceiver is done, the Czar will come, and destroy the infidel Jews. But what does Paul say? He says that *Christ* will come and "destroy him [Antichrist] by the brightness of His coming" (2 Thess. 2, 3—8). And this will be when Christ comes to Judgment, verses 2 and 3. Antichrist, the papacy, will be finally judged and condemned at the coming of Christ on Judgment Day, — that is the plain sense of the passage. It is violently wrenched from its context by Rev. Hoffmann, and fitted in with other passages just as badly maltreated, to "prove" his millennialist ravings. Again: In order to prove that the present war is traceable to the unwillingness of Christian nations to demonstrate that they are "temples of the Holy Spirit," 1 Cor. 3, 16, 17 is quoted: "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy." But this is all wrong. In the first place,

there are not, and there never have been, any "Christian nations," and the text quoted plainly refers to the "body" of the Christian congregation addressed by Paul, the Corinthian Christians. Note also the following: After the word "destroyer" in Dan. 9, 27 ("the desolate"), Rev. Hoffmann inserts in parenthesis: "Gog," without the faintest scintilla of evidence in the text. Is. 6, 13 is made to mean that there will be a minority of believing Jews in Palestine after a wicked king has restored their national existence and established them in the Holy Land. Read the verse, and observe that this remnant is spoken of as existing at a time when the land of Israel shall be "utterly desolate," "the cities wasted, without inhabitant." Quite the reverse of what Rev. Hoffmann seeks and finds in the passage. Thus we might continue almost indefinitely. The entire picture here presented of world-events that might be expected to follow the Great War is utterly devoid of foundation in the Holy Scriptures. Yet the Methodist paper has given more than a dozen columns of space to these prognostications, based on a false reading of history and the Scripture alike.

But the point upon which this entire structure of surmises and predictions rests remains to be investigated. It is the same assumption which formed the basis of the *Presbyterian* and *Sendbote* articles quoted above: the Restoration of Israel as a prelude to the Second Advent of Christ.

Hence, the main question raised by these three interpretations of the war in the light of prophecy may be stated thus:—

Do the Scriptures teach that a restoration of Israel as a nation and a general conversion of the Jews is to be expected?

THE EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE.

The expectation of a final return of Israel to the land and the God of their fathers is based upon a literal interpretation of such texts as the following:—

Ezek. 37, 21: "And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among

the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land."

Is. 66, 20: "And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to My holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord."

Ezek. 39, 25: "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel, and will be jealous for My holy name."

A conversion of the Jews as a nation to Christianity is found, by certain interpreters, in the eleventh chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans:—

Rom. 11, 25: "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. *26*: And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

The question which first of all must receive an adequate answer is this: *When* is this return of Israel to the true worship to be expected according to prophecy? The answer is found in Hosea:—

Hos. 3, 5: "Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord, their God, and David, their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness *in the latter days*."

It is presumed by the literal interpreters of these texts that "the latter days" refer to the time immediately preceding the return of Christ in glory. Has this assumption Scriptural warrant? Read these passages:—

1 Pet. 1, 20: "Who [Christ] verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in *these last times* for you."

Heb. 1, 2: God "hath in *these last days* spoken unto us by His Son."

Acts 2, 17: "And it shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith God, I will *pour out of My Spirit* upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams."

1 Cor. 10, 11: "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for *our* admonition, upon whom *the ends of the world are come.*"

1 John 2, 18: "Little children, *this is the last hour*; and as ye have heard that Antichrist cometh, even now there are many antichrists; whereby we know that *it is the last hour.*"

What do these passages prove? They prove that the "last days" commenced with the coming of the Redeemer in the flesh. What Joel said of the "last days" was fulfilled at Pentecost (*Acts 2, 17*). The Christians living in Corinth, and those addressed by Peter, were living in the "last time of the world." Hence, the passages which were quoted before refer to the conversion of Jews during *the entire New Testament age*. The "last times," the "latter days," and similar expressions are terms applied by the Scriptures to the time which elapses between the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost and the return of Christ in glory. During the entire New Testament age, children of Israel according to the flesh, descendants of Abraham, will be won by the Gospel of Christ.

But does not the word of prophecy tell us that we may expect a return of Israel to Jerusalem? It does. (See *Is. 66, 20*, quoted above.) But are we forced to take this prophecy literally? In the letter to the Hebrews we read: "But ye are come unto Mount Sion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels." (*Heb. 12, 22.*) It is clear that "Jerusalem," "Sion," are here used figuratively for the Christian Church. Certainly, those Hebrews whom the writer addresses were not gathered into the capital of Palestine. Read, in your Bible, the verse immediately following! Compare also such texts as *Is. 52, 2*, which, if taken literally, would mean that only Jews, and no one else (no "uncircumcised"), will ever set his foot on the streets of Jerusalem.

The entire chapter (Is. 52) proves that "Jerusalem" is used figuratively by prophecy as denoting the New Testament Church, composed of Jews and Gentiles converted to the Christian faith.

If the descriptions of a gathering of Israel "to Jerusalem" is to be taken literally, then, by the same law of interpretation, we must take in their literal sense the descriptions of the rebuilding of the temple and reestablishment of the Levitical (bloody) sacrifices on the temple-mount, Ezek. 44, 11; 46, 24. However, this would be in flat contradiction to the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, that through the sacrifice of the Son of God on Calvary all sacrifices for the atonement of sin have been abolished. Read Hebrews, chapters 8, 9, and 10. Few Chiliasts dare to go to the length of taking this renewal of the daily sacrifice in a literal sense; but by accepting these descriptions in a figurative sense, they become untrue to their system of interpretation.

Also the fertility of the ground, the changes in the character of wild beasts, which figure so largely in the prophecies pointing to the Messianic age, would have to be taken literally: the wolf and lamb will dwell together, the calf and the young lion will lie down together, and a little child lead them all, Is. 11, 6. Brass utensils will be replaced by gold, for iron, brass, chap. 60, 17, and the sun and moon will no more go down, verse 20. Lions will eat straw, verse 25. No one thinks of taking all this in any but a figurative sense, as beautiful poetical descriptions of the peace that will obtain in the kingdom of Christ, His Church, the "peace of God that passeth all understanding," the "peace of a good conscience with God." But if this is admittedly spoken in a figurative sense, then why not the descriptions of Israel dwelling safely and at peace in "Canaan," of being "gathered to Jerusalem," of worshiping in "Zion"? Indeed, if we take the figurative descriptions of the New Testament Church, of Messiah's rule, *out* of the Old Testament, there is no prophecy left regarding the Church of the New Testament dispensation. We challenge any Chiliast to point out a single *literal*, strictly literal,

prophecy regarding the New Testament Church, the New Testament ministry, the spread of Christianity through Christian missions, the rule of Christ through the Gospel. All is figurative, — yet easily understood in the light of fulfilment. We hold that there is not one text employed by Chiliasts which does not give very satisfactory and Biblical sense if understood either concerning the Kingdom of Grace or the Kingdom of Glory, Heaven.

The thoughtful reader will not fail to see that the main difficulty of the Restoration-theory lies in the fact that it presumes an irresistible grace. If in a certain period all Jews are to be converted, the grace of God must irresistibly implant faith in the hearts of every member of the race. But God forces no one to believe. Irresistible grace is the error of Calvin. The Scriptures know of no conversion of nations *en masse*.

However, there are numerous statements in Scripture which specifically exclude the notion of a final conversion of the Jews, and their establishment and general ingathering as a nation in the Holy Land. Of the Jews, Paul writes to the Thessalonians that they "killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, *to fill up their sins away*: for the wrath is come upon them *to the uttermost*." (1 Thess. 2, 15 f.) According to this passage the wrath of God has passed "to the uttermost" upon the Jews, their sins being "filled up." How, in the face of such clear assertions, can a general conversion of the Jews be predicted? Nineteen centuries have borne testimony to the truth of these words. The wrath of God has passed upon Israel to the uttermost. Missionary work has no field comparable in hardness, and in all but hopeless sterility, to the Jewish people. To this day the Jews are irreconcilable enemies of Christ. The judgment passed upon them in the word of Old Testament prophecy has been executed. Hardness of heart is the penalty executed upon Israel for its rejection of Messiah. It was announced long ago through

the mouth of Isaiah, chap. 6, 9—13: "And He said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed. Then said I, Lord, how long? And He answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitants, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, and the Lord have removed men far away, and there be a great forsaking in the midst of the land. But yet in it shall be a tenth, and it shall return, and shall be eaten: as a teil-tree and as an oak, whose substance is in them when they cast their leaves, so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof."

In the Gospel according to Matthew (chap. 13, 14, 15) our Savior declares that the final rejection of Israel announced in these verses was even then being executed upon the unbelieving nation, and Paul agrees with Isaiah in saying (Rom. 11) that but a remnant shall be saved out of Israel in the New Testament age.

This is the consonant doctrine of the Old and New Testaments: For her rejection of the Gospel, hardness of heart will come upon Israel. Out of the entire nation but a remnant shall be saved.

In the fifteenth chapter of his prophecies, Jeremiah foretells in most solemn and awful words the dispersion of Israel into the Gentile world, and her untold sufferings by famine, captivity, and the sword; Israel is "cast out"; "thou hast forsaken Me, therefore will I stretch out My hand against thee, and destroy thee, but" — now take note of what follows — "*it shall be well with thy remnant.*" Of the "remnant," God's elect in Israel, Isaiah wrote, chap. 10, 21, 22: "The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return." Observe also here the agreement with Paul, Rom. 11, 5: "Even so, then, *at this present time* also there is a *remnant* according to the election of grace."

THE GATHERING OF ALL ISRAEL.

But does not Paul write, Rom. 11, 26: "All Israel shall be saved"?

Turn to the text in your Bible. In what connection do these words occur? (This is essential. If you take words out of their connection, you can prove almost anything from the Bible.) Paul had referred in the preceding chapter to the rejection of Israel as a nation. Now, in chap. 11 he asks (v. 1): "I say, then, Hath God cast away His people?" And the reply is (v. 2): "God hath not cast away His people *which He foreknew*": His elect will be saved, also out of Israel. Verse 5: "At the present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." Then he says (v. 25): "I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness *in part* is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And *so* all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is My covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins."

What the Spirit here would say through Paul is clear: Since the Jews were rejected as a nation because of their unbelief, it might appear as if no Jew could hereafter be saved. But to Paul was revealed a "mystery," something he could not know except by divine revelation (compare Eph. 3, 3), and this mystery is that the "blindness" of Israel, her hardness of heart, is "in part." Not only in Paul's time were there elect among the Jews; this the Romans knew very well (Paul himself being a Jew, v. 1); throughout the New Testament age, "until the fulness of the Gentiles" (the elect among the non-Jewish races) "be come in," until every elect child of God has been converted, to the end of time, this blindness shall endure; but this blindness shall be "in part," it was not to include every single Jewish individual. "And so all Israel shall be saved." Note well, he does not say: "And then all Israel shall be saved," but: "*So.*" *In this way* the elect among the Jews will be saved: throughout the

age of the Gentiles, the New Testament age, God will search out and find His own elect among the Jews in spite of the fact that sentence of blindness has been pronounced upon the nation. "All Israel," then, means, all the true sons of Abraham (Gal. 3, 7), those among them whom God in His unsearchable wisdom (v. 33) has chosen from everlasting to be saved, the elect among the Jews of all ages.

In this sense ("Israel" = "the elect Israelites") the word "Israel" is frequently used in prophecy. Turning to Ezekiel, we find, chap. 20, 40: "For in Mine holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel, saith the Lord God, there shall *all the house* of Israel, *all of them* in the land, serve Me; there will I accept them, and there will I require your offerings and the first-fruits of your oblations, with all your holy things." Now read verse 38, in the same chapter: "I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against Me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel." So there will be those, in the latter days, who will be purged out from Israel, who will not enter the kingdom of God ("land of Israel"). Yet those who do enter are called, in verse 40, above quoted, "ALL THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL." Does this not prove that "all Israel" is a term applied by Scripture to God's elect among the Jews, the remnant which remains after the wicked are purged out? And so in the passage from Rom. 11. Again, turn to Is. 19. There "Israel" (without limitation) is called "the inheritance of God." Yet in chapter 10, verse 21, it is said that only a "remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob. Though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return." Here again we find positive proof that "Israel" (Is. 19, 25) = "elect, remnant of Israel." Those who truly deserve the name "Israelites" are the chosen children of that race, even as it is said of "Egypt" and "Assyria" (without limitation) that they are blessed (Is. 20, 25), although the prophet has previously made very plain the fact that both Assyria and Egypt will be rejected on account of their pride and unbelief, and that only

a remnant out of these nations in the course of time will enter the kingdom of Christ.

Only so can we understand those texts in which it is said that not only "Israel," but the whole Gentile world will come to "Jerusalem," will be gathered to "Zion." Isaiah foretells, chap. 49, the conversion of many far-off nations by saying that they "shall come" to the land of Israel: chap. 49, 12: "Behold, these shall come from afar; and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim" (China). Chap. 60, 3—6: "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee. Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see and flow together, and thine heart shall fear and be enlarged, because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, *the forces of the Gentiles* shall come unto thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah. *All they* from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord."

Now if we take in their literal sense the prophecies which foretell a gathering of "Israel" unto "Zion," then we are forced to take literally also these statements regarding the heathen of all lands, a supposition which is too absurd to be entertained even for a moment by any sane person. Such interpretation is excluded, moreover, by the plain words of the Spirit speaking by John (11, 52): "Being high priest that year, he [Caiaphas] prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation [the Jews], and not for that nation only, but that also He should *gather together* in one the children of God that were scattered abroad," the elect among the Gentiles, all that should believe in Him in all time to come among all nations. This "gathering" of the elect among the nations, their conversion to Christ through the preaching of the Gospel, is prefigured in prophecy as a "coming unto Zion" of all nations. Dying Jacob says: "Unto Him," Messiah, "shall the gathering of the people be," Gen. 49, 10. Even

so the texts which speak of a "gathering" of Israel to Jerusalem can mean nothing else than the conversion of God's elect from among the rejected Jewish people during the New Testament age, beginning with the birth of Christ.

To sum up.

It is maintained that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, as a probable outcome of the present war, would be a fulfilment of certain prophecies foretelling the restoration of Israel to the land of Palestine and the general conversion of all Jewry.

We have examined the passages upon which the expectation of a restored and converted Israel is based, and have found them to be in harmony, if properly understood, with all other Scriptures dealing with the future of the Jewish race: Israel will remain hardened to the end, during the New Testament age only a remnant shall be saved, and the race will be scattered among the Gentiles until Christ returns unto Judgment.

We conclude that all interpretations of prophecy based upon the notion of a universal conversion of the Jews gathered in Palestine must be ruled out as proof for the assertion that "the war has been foretold." This idea is the keystone of the structure reared by Rev. I. I. Hoffmann in *Der Apologete*. Take it out of the program of future history he there presents, and there remains but a jumble of disconnected fancies. So, too, the articles in the *Presbyterian* and the *Sendbote*, above referred to, are based upon the assumption that all Jews will be gathered into Palestine and there finally converted.⁵⁾ So far as the assertion that "this war has been foretold" rests on this assumption, proven false by our painstaking investigation, the efforts made to connect the war with prophecy have failed.

5) Reference has been made in these articles to Zionism, a movement which has for its object the colonization of Palestine with Jews. Rev. Reinke said: "The Zionist banner is already in existence, and the vast resources of the Children of Abraham will warrant the stupendous undertaking of a national restoration." Every writer on the subject whose work has come to my

Chapter 3. — The Millennium.

Let us now examine another line of evidence which has of late been very assiduously worked in support of the notion that there are in the sacred Scriptures direct references to the present war. Most of the articles, pamphlets, and books called forth by this discussion presume the correctness of the millennial theory. Their authors believe in a millennium. They are Chiliasts.

What is the true meaning of Chiliasm? — That question is difficult to answer. For there have never been, and there are not now, two Chiliasts agreeing in their views upon this subject. The points, however, in which all agree are the following: Christ must return in His glory, in order to establish a great kingdom on earth, and together with His saints, to govern the world during one thousand years, till the coming of the Last Judgment. At this period (or previous to it) the Jews also shall be converted *en masse*. From those thousand years the word Chiliasm is derived; for *chilia*, in the Greek language, signifies 1000; and Chiliasts, therefore, are persons who believe in the expected Millennium. This word also, being composed of the Latin *mille* (thousand) and *annus* (year), denotes Christ's supposed millennial reign.

There is, however, a great diversity of opinion among Chiliasts as to what is to be the condition of that Millennium.

notice draws the same kind of comfort from the Zionist movement. It should be noted, however, 1) that the Jews are far from giving their unanimous assent to the plan of colonizing the Holy Land with Jews. It is fathered principally by Reform Jews, who have given up their ancient religion. Orthodox Jews oppose the movement. 2) Louis D. Brandeis, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, is chairman of the Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs. He writes in the *Outlook* (January 5, 1916): "Zionism is not a movement to transport all the Jews in the world to Palestine. That, indeed, would be impossible; for Palestine is only about the size of Massachusetts. There are 14,000,000 Jews in the world, and Palestine could not accommodate more than one-fifth of the number." This, from an authoritative source, ought to count for something.

The greater part of them contended, or still contend, that Jerusalem shall be the seat of government. They believe that the life of the elect will resemble a perpetual wedding-feast, and that milk and honey will flow in streams, and so forth. The Chiliastic Jews suppose that then all Gentiles, all who are not Jews, will be their slaves. Others have imagined that during the thousand years of Satan's imprisonment an unbroken peace, even among beasts, and tranquillity, unanimity, and spirituality would prevail throughout the world, and so on. In short, every Chiliast pictured his millennial Sabbath according to his inclinations as delightful as possible by ascribing to it characteristics more or less material or spiritual, sensual or intellectual, gross or refined. Most Chiliasts taught, or still teach, that, previous to the Sabbath-thousand of years, there "shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be." Chiliasts agree in teaching two resurrections: first, the resurrection of the saints, and one thousand years later, the resurrection of the wicked. Then the Judgment.

What year, will be asked, is stated to be the beginning of the Millennium? — Concerning this point also Chiliasts are not all agreed, because there are a hundred different chronologies, professedly Biblical, and the apocalyptic numbers of Daniel and John, by means of which Chiliasts have attempted to determine the epoch in question exactly, admit of a thousand different explanations. The Jews in the East, as is related by an eye-witness, Missionary Fjeldstedt, expected the Messiah and the beginning of the Millennium in 1810, since, according to the Hebrew Testament, the sixth year-thousand after Adam expired (?) in 1810. When Missionary Fjeldstedt asked those same Jews, ten years later, why their Messiah had failed to appear in 1810, they replied that the present Hebrew Bible must contain some chronological errors. The western Jews, as well as the learned Abarbanel, expected the Messiah, notwithstanding that, according to the Talmud, "all periods are past," in the year

1466. Furthermore, the commencement of the Millennium, prophetically announced in the Old Testament, was placed by Whiston in 1776, by Jurieu in 1785, by Bengel in 1836, by Miller in 1843, by Sander in 1847, by Schnucker in 1848, by the author of the *Periods of the Christian Church* in 1879 to 1887, by others in 1866, and 1868, and 1880, and so forth.⁶⁾

No two Chiliasts agree in their interpretation of prophecy with reference to the Great War. Broadly speaking, there is unanimity only on two points:—

All Chiliasts to-day believe that previous to the thousand-year reign of Christ there will be a conversion of the Jews as a people. To this assumption a sufficient answer, I believe, has been given in these pages. All Chiliasts also agree in their expectation of a time of great affliction and sorrow to precede the ushering in of the Millennium. However, right here there is a sharp divergency of opinion among them. Some believe that the present war is the affliction of the “latter days,” to be followed upon its conclusion by an earthly reign of Christ in glory. By far the greater number, however, hold that the last struggle is yet to come. They believe that the present war is significant mainly because it will lead to the “restoration” of Israel. Each of these positions, moreover, is supported by interpreters of prophecy who believe that it is possible to establish their respective views by chronological calculations based on the apocalyptic numbers of Scripture (Seventy Weeks, 1260, etc.).

Our investigation will include an appraisal, in detail, of the arguments advanced for both of these basic contentions—of the arguments advanced for identifying the present war with certain conflicts foretold by prophecy, as well as of the arguments for another final struggle, subsequent to the war. However, before these lines of proof are taken up in detail, it will help to clear our vision if we, first of all, investigate the proposition on which all these views concerning the war are based, the proposition that before

6) G. Seyffarth, *Chiliasm Critically Examined*, p. 1 ff.

the end of the world Christ will reign on earth with His saints in glory for one thousand years. Briefly, then, the question is this: Does the Bible teach a Millennium?

The passage upon which the Chiliast contention rests is Rev. 20, herewith reprinted entire:—

THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER OF REVELATION.

“1. And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. 2. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, 3. and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season. 4. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them. And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. 5. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. 6. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years. 7. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, 8. and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. 9. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. 10. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever. 11. And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose

face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. 12. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life. And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. 13. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. 14. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. 15. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.”

Now observe,

1) That there is no mention here of any restoration of the Jewish race and their general conversion to Christianity. If there is such an intimate connection between Israel's “restoration” and the “Millennium” as Chiliasts insist upon, then why is no Jewish “restoration” here even so much as hinted at?

2) This is the only passage in Scripture which applies the term “one thousand years” to the duration of the Messianic kingdom.

3) The description of the “Millennium” as a period when all wars will cease on earth, when there will be a universal reign of the “Golden Rule” among men, when the “kingdom of God” will extend over all the earth, — all these elements of the Chiliastic construction are not found in this chapter, the only one in the whole Bible which speaks of a “thousand-year” rule of Christ. This must be kept in view. The burden of proof rests upon the Chiliasts, that the Old Testament passages which are constantly quoted as referring to the “Millennium” of Rev. 20 actually stand in such relation to this passage.

4) This chapter in Revelation employs elaborate imagery. It mentions an angel having a key and a chain in his hand. Was this a real, material chain, made up of heavy iron links? There is mention of a dragon. Was this a real animal with claws and tail, which was cast by the angel into a real pit

dug somewhere on the earth? Was a real, material seal fastened to the lid of this pit? Every reader will admit that the key, chain, and seal symbolize power and authority, that the dragon is Satan, and the pit, hell. Now when we accept, as we must, these terms as being used figuratively, why can we not accept "1000" in a figurative sense as signifying a long period of time? You might not go so far as to say that "1000" *must* be taken figuratively; but you cannot deny that "1000" *may* be taken in a figurative sense, since the other descriptive elements of the passage are so evidently symbolical and figurative.

5) No matter whether you believe that "one thousand years" in this passage means one thousand years of 365 days each, or whether you accept these words to signify "a long period of time," the chapter may be interpreted in harmony with other passages of Scripture which foretell the reign of Christ in the Christian Church from Pentecost to the end of all things. Dr. Milton S. Terry, in his *Biblical Hermeneutics*, says: "We understand that the Millennium is now in progress. It dates from the consummation of the Jewish age. It is a round definite number used symbolically for an indefinite aeon [period]. It is the period of the Messianic reign. Since the dawn of Christianity the powers of darkness have been repressed" (Satan has been chained); "yet there is nothing in the Scriptures to warrant the idea that the entire period is to be one of uniform and unclouded blessedness and glory," as the Chiliasts teach.⁷) There have been orthodox interpreters who accept the words "one thousand years" in the literal sense, and yet reject Chiliasm, lock, stock, and barrel. Hence it is not true that the entire Chiliastic view—the reign of Christ in visible form on earth with all converted Jews and the resurrected saints, when all sin shall be wiped out—must be accepted if we take "1000" in the literal sense. Those ideas have been

7) A simple, evangelical exposition of this chapter can be found in Rev. F. C. G. Schumm's *Essay on Revelation 20*. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 12 cents.)

added unto Rev. 20 by Chiliastic interpreters, but are not found there.

6) The passages from the Old Testament quoted as descriptions of the Millennium either describe the blessedness of membership in the kingdom of God (the Christian Church), or they plainly refer to the bliss of the saints in heaven. Not a single one of the passages so frequently quoted from Isaiah, Ezekiel, and other Old Testament writings as referring to the Millennium so much as mentions "one thousand years."

7) When Christ was asked by His disciples to describe the last world-age, so they might know when to expect His coming, He does not, in His reply, so much as hint at a reign in glory on earth before His final coming to Judgment. On the contrary, when He returns, the end is at hand, Matt. 24, 3; compare 1 Cor. 15, 23. 24.

8) We are taught that Judgment Day will come as a thief in the night, like a fowler's snare, like lightning, etc. No one but God knows when it will come (Mark 13, 32). If there preceded a Millennium, the entire Christian world would know one thousand years in advance when "our Lord will come to Judgment." At the coming of the Lord the earth will be destroyed, 2 Pet. 3, 10. Hence there will be no *place* for a Millennium.

9) The age preceding the end of all things is described by our Lord and His apostles (compare also Rev. 20, 7. 8) as an age abounding in wickedness. Unbelief, false doctrine, false prophets, much sorrow and affliction, wickedness mounting steadily, until, if it were possible, even the elect would be lost,—such are the marks of the last world-age. This is in absolute contrast to the picture painted by Chiliasm. The description which our Lord gives of the Latter Days leaves no *time* for a Millennium. Wickedness abounds until He comes, and then there is the End.

10) There will not be an interval of one thousand years between the resurrection of the just and the resurrection of the wicked. All will be raised on the last day of the world:—

1 Cor. 15, 22—24: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's, at His coming. *Then cometh the end*, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power."

John 5, 28. 29: "Marvel not at this; for *the hour* is coming in the which *all* that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

On the strength of these Scripture-passages the Christian Church, in all its confessional writings, consistently teaches one resurrection, not two. The Lutheran Confessions distinctly reject Chiliasm as false doctrine, *Augsb. Con.*, Art. 17.

We conclude that there is no warrant for the Chiliastic assumption in Scripture, and, hence, that *all interpretations of prophecy with reference to the Great War which are based on the Chiliastic idea must of necessity be false and unscriptural.*

In view of the fact that the bulk of Prophecy-and-the-War literature is based upon the idea of a Millennium, this is a very important conclusion. It really makes unnecessary any further investigation of the arguments by which Chiliasts point out the relevancy of prophecy to the great conflict. However, our millennialists have succeeded in diverting the interest of many Christians to the study of certain prophecies which are supposed to bear some relation to the great world struggle, and even, it is believed by some, to give a clue to its final issue. There are those who believe at least that certain nations involved in the war are distinctly and specifically pointed at by the finger of inspiration. Others believe and endeavor to prove that the apocalyptic numbers of Scripture not only indicate this war as foretold by prophecy, but render it possible to say exactly when all Israel will be converted, when the governments of the world

will be abolished, and when the Lord will appear to usher in the Millennium. The results obtained by such computations are, as a rule, very fantastic, sometimes altogether absurd. One Chiliast believes, and demonstrates to his own satisfaction, that a socialistic state will be established in 1925; another confidently expects the defeat of the Allies because England is the Gog of Ezek. 38, whose downfall is foretold. These and other results of literal interpretation are announced with great assurance, and there are even now thousands of Christians who accept these wild surmises as articles of Christian faith which only a skeptic should dare to reject as unscriptural. The answer to the question, "Who is Gog?" is in some circles regarded as a shibboleth of true Bible-Christianity, while others would gauge our spiritual life by our acceptance or rejection of certain dates which result from their calculations. A Chiliastic wave is gaining momentum every day as it sweeps across the country; clergymen of Chiliast leanings in all denominations gather in conference to discuss the war in the light of prophecy; such papers as the *Christian Herald* open their columns to the spokesmen of Chiliasm, thus adding immeasurably to the confusion; even the county papers are beginning to take notice of Armageddon and Gog's Defeat, and Christians are turning to their Bibles everywhere with an indefinite feeling of disquiet, lest they grieve the Spirit of God which is now revealing to His saints the hidden wisdom of Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and John. It is well that we look into the evidence, and observe how far these interpretations accord with the sacred Word, and on what historical proof they rest their claim for a respectful hearing.

Chapter 4. — Gog and Magog.

As the prophecy in Ezekiel concerning Gog is the basis of much that has been written about the war, chapter thirty-eight, in which this prophecy is found, is herewith, for convenient reference, reprinted entire:—

"1. And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,

2. Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him, 3. and say, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal: 4. and I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of armor, even a great company with bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords: 5. Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya with them; all of them with shield and helmet; 6. Gomer and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands; and many people with thee. 7. Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou and all thy company that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them. 8. After many days thou shalt be visited; in the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword, and is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste; but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely all of them. 9. Thou shalt ascend and come like a storm, thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou and all thy bands, and many people with thee.

“10. Thus saith the Lord God, It shall also come to pass that at the same time shall things come into mind, and thou shalt think an evil thought. 11. And thou shalt say, I will go up to the land of unvalled villages; I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell safely, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates, 12. to take a spoil, and to take a prey; to turn thine hand upon the desolate places that are now inhabited, and upon the people that are gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods, that dwell in the midst of the land. 13. Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? Hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?

“14. Therefore, son of man, prophesy and say unto Gog,

Thus saith the Lord God, In that day, when My people of Israel dwelleth safely, shalt thou not know it? 15. And thou shalt come out of thy place in the north parts, thou and many people with thee, all of them riding on horses, a great company, and a mighty army. 16. And thou shalt come up against My people of Israel as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against My land, that the heathen may know Me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes.

“17. Thus saith the Lord God, Art thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by My servants, the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days many years that I would bring thee against them?

“18. And it shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the Lord God, that My fury shall come up in My face. 19. For in My jealousy and in the fire of My wrath have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel, 20. so that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at My presence, and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground. 21. And I will call for a sword against him throughout all My mountains, saith the Lord God; every man's sword shall be against his brother. 22. And I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. 23. Thus will I magnify Myself and sanctify Myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations, and they will know that I am the Lord.”

The salient portion of chapter 39 (vv. 1—6) reads:—

“1. Therefore, thou son of man, prophesy against Gog and say, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal. 2. And I will turn thee back, and leave but the sixth part of thee,

and will cause thee to come up from the north parts, and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel. 3. And I will smite thy bow out of thy left hand, and will cause thine arrows to fall out of thy right hand. 4. Thou shalt fall upon the mountains of Israel, thou and all thy bands, and the people that is with thee: I will give thee unto the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured. 5. Thou shalt fall upon the open field; for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God.

"6. And I will send a fire on Magog, and among them that dwell carelessly in the isles; and they shall know that I am the Lord. 7. So I will make My holy name known in the midst of My people Israel; and I will not let them pollute My holy name any more; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, the Holy One in Israel."

These two chapters may be summarized as follows: Against Israel a combination of hostile powers arises. They threaten the destruction of the Holy People, but God arises in His wrath, and utterly destroys the enemies of His People. And when is this to happen? Verse 8 of chapter 38 says: "In the latter years," the words applied in prophecy to the age of the New Testament Gospel, beginning with the birth of our Lord and continuing to the Day of Judgment.

Now let us hear the Chiliast interpretation of these chapters. Under the caption, "The Invasion of Israel's Land," the November (1917) issue of *Our Hope*, a religious paper published under the editorship of the Rev. A. C. Gaebelein, contained the following analysis of Ezek. 38:—

"Careful research has established the fact that the progenitor of Rosh was Tiraz (Gen. 10, 2), and that Rosh is Russia. All students of prophecy are agreed that this is the correct meaning of Rosh. The prince of Rosh means, therefore, the prince or king of the Russian Empire. But he also is in control of Meshech and Tubal, which are reproduced in the modern Moscow and Tobolsk. Russia, we may well conclude from this, will furnish the man who will lead this confederacy of nations.

“Well known it is that Russia has been in the past the most pronounced and bitterest enemy of the Jewish people. What she passes through to-day is but a fulfilment of what the Lord has spoken: ‘I will curse them that curse thee.’ To-day the Jews in Russia may have bright hopes of getting their rights and complete emancipation at last. For a time this may come to pass, but ultimately Russia will turn against them, and like Pharaoh did, when Israel had left his domain, so this coming King of the North, the prince of Rosh, when Israel is back in the land, will turn against them.

“Valuable information is given in the Talmud; Gomer is there stated to be the Germani, the Germans. That the descendants of Gomer moved northward and established themselves in parts of Germany seems to be an established fact. All this is of much interest. Germany did not belong to the Roman Empire, at least the greater part of Germany was never conquered by Rome. She will therefore not participate in the Western confederacy. Will she, then, become united to Russia, and march under the prince of Rosh into the land of Israel? We cannot be sure about all these things. This, however, we know, that a powerful confederacy of nations, under the leadership of the prince of Rosh, Meschech, and Tubal, will come up against Immanuel’s land, when Israel has been restored and dwells safely.”

The *Christian Herald*, in its issue of November 7, 1917, contained an article entitled, “What the Bible Teaches About Russia,” by Rev. James M. Gray, D. D., dean of the Moody Institute, Chicago. Ezekiel’s prophecy concerning Gog is there interpreted as follows:—

“At the beginning of the 38th chapter of Ezekiel the prophet is told to set his face ‘toward Gog of the land of Magog, the chief prince of Rosh, Meschech, and Tubal, and prophesy against him.’ There is no dispute among the philologists and archeologists that ‘Gog’ and ‘Magog’ here stand for a powerful Scythian dynasty of Ezekiel’s time. Besides this, we have in ‘Gog’ the first syllable of the word ‘Caucasus,’ the name of the mountain range crossing the

peninsula of Russia, which divides the Caspian from the Black Sea.

"In 'Rosh' also we have the first syllable of 'Russia,' while 'Meshech' and 'Tubal' are the original forms of 'Moscow' and 'Tobolsk,' which were immemorially in possession of that nation. A reliable ancient map placed by the side of a reliable modern one will identify the territories.

"But it is a prophecy of divine anger against her, and the nations which are allied with her. These are named as 'Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya . . . ; Gomer and all his hordes; the house of Togarmah in the uttermost parts of the north, and all his hordes. . . . Be thou prepared, yea, prepare thyself, thou and all thy companies that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them.'

"'Persia' we identify; 'Ethiopia' is thought to mean the present Abyssinia; 'Libya,' a part of Egypt; 'Gomer' has for its latest analog 'Crimea,'⁸) and 'Togarmah' some would identify with Armenia and others with 'Turkestan.'

"Germany is not mentioned in this list, indeed, except as she may be included in the name of some of the countries whose boundaries are not clearly defined. But what the Bible omits in this case the Russian annals to which we refer later may be said to include.

"But what of the *time* when this shall be fulfilled? As verses 1—7 indicate the nation, so verses 8—12 indicate the time.

"It will be 'after many days' and 'in the latter years,' a Hebrew idiom pointing to the close of the present dispensation. But whether or not this is the case, it must be a period still future, for the reason that the military combination referred to in verses 5—7 has not yet appeared in history. Russia with Persia, Egypt, and the other nations in her train represents a mobilization of armies which the world has yet to witness.

"But, furthermore, it will be the time when Israel shall

8) *Our Hope* identifies "Gomer" with "Germany," so we have seen.

be gathered again in her own land, and when she shall be dwelling in comparative quietness and safety (see verses 8, 11, 12).

“And now, what of the results? What shall be the consequence of this invasion of Palestine on the part of Russia? Read verses 18 to 23 of chapter 38, and 1 to 24 of chapter 39.

“God’s fury shall come up into His nostrils, and He will not only slay them with the sword, but with pestilence and the forces of nature, such as rain and hailstones, and fire and brimstone, like unto Sodom and Gomorrah.

“Of course, dogmatic assertions are out of place, but if our interpretation of Ezekiel be correct, then the present alliance of Russia with the Western nations is not likely to be permanent, for they are of the original Roman Empire, to which she never belonged. And for this reason it is more likely that one of these days the relationship of Russia and Germany shall become close; for Germany, like Russia, was never of the Roman Empire, except as to that part of her territory west of the Rhine.”

A comparison of this interpretation with that of Dr. A. C. Gaebelein in *Our Hope* reveals an essential agreement on two points:—

1. Both Dr. Gray and Dr. Gaebelein proceed on the assumption that in the latter days, a term which is interpreted as referring to the *close* of the present dispensation, there will be a restoration of Israel,—an assumption for which we have been able to find no evidence either in the Old or the New Testament.

2. Both interpreters read in Ezek. 38, 2 “prince of Rosh” instead of “chief prince” as in our Authorized Version of the Bible, and identify “Rosh” with Russia.

ARE THE RUSSIANS REFERRED TO IN EZEK. 38?

As for accepting “Rosh” as the name of a people, Dr. Gaebelein very much overstates the case when he says: “Careful research has established the fact that the progenitor of ‘Rosh’ was Tiraz (Gen. 10, 2), and that ‘Rosh’ is Russia. All students of prophecy are agreed that this is the correct

meaning of 'Rosh.' The prince of 'Rosh' means, therefore, the prince or king of the Russian Empire." But there is no such agreement of "all students of prophecy." The word "rosh" occurs 67 times in the Old Testament, and our English Bible translates it 67 times with "chief." The word was also in the passage before us translated with "chief" (ἄρχοντα) 2,000 years ago by the Alexandrian translators (Septuaginta). In the entire Old Testament it does not occur a single time as the name of a people. The identification with Tiraz is not accepted by any scholar to-day, nor has it ever had any vogue among Hebraists. Attempts have been made to discover the name of a nation resembling "Rosh" in ancient literature, but all such efforts have similarly failed. It is still a very moot question among scholars whether "rosh" in this verse really is the name of a nation. Indeed, no salient reason has ever been advanced why "rosh" should not be translated "chief" ("chief prince," "oberster Fuerst"), as in our English and German Bibles. That is the accepted meaning of the word in the other 66 passages in which it occurs. The entire connecting up of this prophecy with the Russian Empire is therefore based upon a very doubtful assumption.

Let us grant, however, for the sake of argument, that "Rosh," in Ezek. 38, 2, is the name of a nation. The question next arises, Can these "Rosh" of Ezekiel's day be identified with the Russians of 1917? Dr. Gray says: "In 'Rosh' we have the first syllable of 'Russia,'" and Dr. Gaebelein goes so far as to say that "all students of prophecy are agreed that this is the correct meaning of 'Rosh.' Prince of Rosh means prince or king of the Russian Empire." Such confident assertion, however, is not warranted by the facts. To derive "Russia" from "Rosh" is an impossible etymology. Not until the ninth century does the word "Rus" appear as a name for the inhabitants of what now is a part of Russia. Nor is this name of Oriental, but of Scandinavian origin. The "Rus" were the Normans who invaded Russia in the ninth century. They came from Sweden, and their name *Rothsmenn* (*Rudermaenner*, rowers, seafarers) was mispronounced

by the earlier (Finnish) settlers of Russia as Ruotsi, soon abbreviated into Rus. To this day the Finns call Sweden Ruotsemoa.⁹⁾ Hence, the connection of Russia with "Rosh," Ezek. 38, 2, is definitely ruled out, and the identification of "prince of Rosh" with the Czar of Russia becomes a manifest absurdity. Neither Hengstenberg, nor Keil, nor Kraetschmar, nor any scholarly work of reference in our day attempts to interpret this verse as referring to the Russians. How Dr. Gaebelcin can say that "all students of prophecy are agreed," and "that careful research has established the fact that Rosh is Russia," passes comprehension. The evidence is absolutely negative.

But does not the identification of "Rosh" with "Russia" gain some probability from the circumstance that the "prince of Rosh (?)" is called also prince of "Meshech and Tubal"? Dr. Gaebelcin writes in *Our Hope*: "Meshech and Tubal are reproduced in the modern Moscow and Tobolsk. Russia, we may conclude from this, will furnish the man who will lead this confederacy of nations." And Dr. Gray, in the *Christian Herald*: "Meshech and Tubal are the original forms of 'Moscow' and 'Tobolsk,' which were immemorially in possession of that nation. A reliable ancient map placed by the side of a reliable modern one will identify the territories." Let us accept this challenge. We shall place next to the map of Russia in the *Century Atlas* the great work of C. Kruse: *Atlas zur Uebersicht der Geschichte aller europaeischen Laender und Staaten*. We look for Moscow on the oldest map in Kruse, representing the countries and cities known to civilization in the beginning of the fifth century, A. D. 400: there is no Moscow; A. D. 500 — no Moscow; A. D. 600 — no Moscow. We turn one map after another until, in the twelfth century, we find "Moskva," and in the explanatory notes: "Built 1156." Is this "*immemorial*"? Furthermore: Moskva (Moscow) was even then not "in possession of the Russian nation," for the simple reason

9) *Encycl. Brit.* XXIII, p. 868. Cf. R. Kleinpaul, *Menschen- und Voelkernamen*, p. 312.

that the Russian nation did not yet exist. Moscow was first settled by Finns. (*Encycl. Brit.*, s. v.) Now as to Tobolsk. One might well ask, Why should the prophet select this far-off arctic corner of Siberia with a population of a scant million and a half, when he wishes to describe "Russia"? But note that according to Dr. Gray also Tobolsk ("Tubal") was "immemorially" in the possession of Russia. Is this true? It is not. Until 1577, or about two thousand years after the time of Ezekiel, Siberia was not even visited by any Russian. What is now called Tobolsk was conquered by the Russians as late as 1639!

As for the similarity in sound between "Rosh"—"Russia," "Meshech"—"Moscow," "Tubal"—"Tobolsk," it should be noted that this by no means indicates that the modern words were derived from those in Ezekiel's prophecy. The late Prof. Max Mueller of Oxford, one of the greatest linguists and scholars of the last century, says in his epoch-making "Lectures on the Science of Language" (Second Series, 1867), p. 258: "Etymology" (the science dealing with the derivation of words) "is a science in which identity, or even similarity, whether of sound or meaning, is of no importance whatever. Sound etymology has nothing to do with sound. We know words to be of the same origin which have not a single letter in common, and which differ in meaning as much as black and white. Mere guesses, however plausible, are completely discarded from the province of scientific etymology. And a derivation, even though it be true, is of no real value if it cannot be proved,—a case which happens not unfrequently, particularly with regard to ancient languages, where we must often rest satisfied with refuting false etymologies, without being able to give anything better in their place. We must completely free ourselves from the idea that etymology must chiefly depend on similarity of sound and meaning."¹⁰) Hence, upon this unimpeachable authority, we say that the similarity of

10) This basic principle of etymology is accepted by every philologist in the world to-day.

"Rosh" (if there ever was such a country) and "Russia," "Tubal" and "Tobolsk," "Meshech" and "Moscow," proves absolutely nothing as to the derivation of these words. As for "Russia," we know positively that the word is derived from the Swedish, and not from the name of a people called "Rosh." Hence, we conclude that the entire argument of both Dr. Gray in the *Christian Herald* and of Dr. Gaebelein in *Our Hope* falls to the ground. There is no scintilla of evidence in Ezek. 38 and 39 for the belief that at some time subsequent to the present war the Russian Czar will gather the nations from the north *and the south* (v. 5) to persecute the Jews in Palestine.¹¹⁾

However, the necessity for these forced etymologies by no means resides in the text, but is a logical result of the preconceived notions with which Drs. Gray and Gaebelein approach this chapter. The proper nouns employed in Ezek. 38 undoubtedly once stood for nations known, at least by report, to the Jews. Meshech was a barbaric nation residing in the farthest north of Asia Minor, south of the Black Sea. They are, in all probability, the Moschi referred to by Herodotus, the Musku of Assyrian inscriptions. Tubal is the neighboring tribe of the Tibareni, the Tabalu of the Assyrian records. They dwelt west of the Moschi. The description, in this chapter, of their fierce character, and even of the details of their armament, exactly agrees with the description of the same tribes reported by Herodotus, who lived only one hundred years later than Ezekiel. Gomer is an "obscure and but vaguely known nation of the barbarous North." (*MacClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia*, Vol. III, p. 920.) They have been quite generally identified with the Cimmerians referred to by Homer. The "house of Togarmah" is the ancient population of Armenia. To these various tribes of the far North the general name Scythians

11) The etymologies on which this entire structure of surmise has been raised are about as reliable as the suggestion found in one commentary, that "Rosh" means "Russians" because the Cossacks have fine horses and the German word for horse is "Ross"!

was applied by the ancients. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Jewish writer Josephus, who lived in the first century of the Christian era, renders Gog with "Scythians." From all this it has been not unreasonably concluded that Gog and Magog to the Jews in Ezekiel's day signified the fierce northern tribes whose territory lay upon the borders of the Black Sea and in the Caucasus, though it must be said that Magog "cannot be explained or illustrated from any source."¹²) In Ezekiel's prophecy these northern tribes are allied with the Persians of the East and the "Ethiopians and Libyans," two savage tribes of Africa, in the South. From Genesis, chapter 10, we glean the bare fact that Gomer, Magog, Tubal, Meshech, and Togarmah were nations descended from Japheth, the son of Noah, and that the "Ethiopians and Libyans" (Cush and Phut), were descendants of Ham.

But this is a word of prophecy. All that is described in these two chapters will occur "after many days." "In the latter years thou shalt come," v. 8; "it shall be in the latter days," v. 16, is said of Gog and his allies. These expressions, as we have seen, in the language of prophecy, signify the Gospel-age. The Apostle John makes reference to this same onslaught in the Book of Revelation as an event which in his day was yet to come to pass: "Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." Rev. 20, 8. 9. But since John penned his prophecy, nineteen hundred years have elapsed. The question then arises, Has this prediction concerning Gog and Magog been realized in this long interval of time, or is the fulfilment of Ezek. 38 and 39 and Rev. 20 still to be expected?

12) J. F. McCurdy, *Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, p. 15.

IS ENGLAND GOG?

An attempt has been made to identify the present war with the campaign of Gog and Magog. In a treatise¹³⁾ entitled, *The World War in the Light of Prophecy. Part One: Gog and His Defeat*, published in 1915, the author presents "evidences that England is the Gog of prophecy, and is therefore doomed to be defeated." This startling thesis is developed as follows:

Page 27: "We desire to show first that all nations mentioned in this prophecy are fighting on the side of the Allies, and secondly, that England, by assuming the leading rôle amongst them, appears in the character of Gog."

Read this again, and you will observe that our author must prove two things: 1) that he is able to identify Gog, Magog, Meshech, Tubal, etc., with nations existing to-day; 2) that these existing nations, the descendants of the nations mentioned in Ezekiel's prophecy, are all fighting on the side of the Allies.

"In a general way," says our author, "the description fits England and Russia, who now fight side by side against Germany and Austria. It may be said of Russia as well as of England that they 'come up from the north parts,' but only of England that 'they dwell carelessly on the isles' (39, 6)."

But is this true? Did Russia "come up from the North"? It came from the East. North of Germany is not Russia, but the Baltic Sea. As for the "isles" on which Gog is here said to dwell, it should be noted that the verse quoted (39, 6) makes no such assertion. Their location is not specified. Besides, when the word "isles" occurs in the Scriptures, it is by no means used in so strict a sense as the English "island." *MacCintock and Strong's Encyclopedia*, Vol. III, p. 338, has this comment on Ezek. 39, 6: "Isles certainly must not be taken necessarily to indicate islands, but it is apparently limited to maritime, transmarine, and very remote regions." This is the consistent Scripture use of the word

13) Submitted to the present writer with a request for review.

isles. It means islands, but it also means lands of the seacoast and land bordering upon the sea. Is. 14, 22 isles is used with reference to Babylon, which had no islands, but fronted on the seacoast. Similarly Phoenicia and the coast region of Palestine are referred to by the same appellation, and this is an ordinary and not at all an exceptional use of the word. Hence there is in "isles" (Ezek. 39, 6) no support for the notion that Gog will dwell upon the British Isles.

But to continue:—

"Of both," England and Russia, "it might be said that they are at the head of the peoples mentioned by the prophet, but to England only applies the prophecy that it rules in the land of Magog, and that it is the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal.

"Magog, in Gen. 10, 2, is named as the second son of Japheth. The land of Magog is therefore the territory occupied by the descendants of Japheth. Is there anything known concerning these descendants? Hieronymus says: 'Magog represents the Scythians, those numerous tribes who live north of the Caucasus and east of the Caspian Sea as far as India.' Josephus agrees with Hieronymus, but Suidas avers that Magog are the Persians. . . .

"According to the most ancient traditions the region between India and the Caspian Sea was occupied originally by the Eastern Aryans and peopled by the descendants of Magog, whom we, therefore, consider the pattern of the Aryan tribes. . . .

"In the first century before and the first century after Christ, Scythians migrated into India, settling in the north-west corner of that territory, which they conquered and ruled for more than 500 years. . . .

"All these investigations concerning the whereabouts of the descendants of Magog disclose the fact that their original home is now partly under Russian dominion, but a larger portion, comprising almost twice the number of the Czar's subjects, is controlled by British rule. India is therefore undoubtedly the land of Magog, and since it is under the

dominion of England, England is the Gog of Ezekiel's prophecy."

Here we note:—

1) If the land of Magog is the "territory occupied by the descendants of Japheth," it includes Germany as well, since the Germans certainly are a Japhetic (Indo-german) race.

2) Accepting the equation Magog = Scythians, it by no means follows that India is the "land of Magog." The Scythian invasion referred to never led to an establishment of a Scythian kingdom beyond the Indus River, which is very close to the extreme northwestern boundary of India. When the Scythians attempted to penetrate into the interior of India, they were met and repulsed by a native monarch, about the year B. C. 56. That in the course of time elements of Scythian origin filtered into the Indian states is possible, but there has never been a preponderance of Scythian blood in the Indian race, which had emigrated to India from their Central-Asiatic home more than a thousand years B. C. In fact, "there is no probability for the assumption that the Indian Scyths have ever dwelt in the countries about the Bactrian Sea,"¹⁴⁾ as our author seems to believe on the strength of an ancient tradition (p. 28, "east of the Caspian Sea"). Concerning the Scyths that penetrated to India, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* reflects recent scholarship when it says, with commendable humility: "*Nothing is known of their language and race.*"¹⁵⁾ To call the 261,000,000 Aryan inhabitants of India "descendants of Magog," as is done by our author, is very wide of the facts established by ethnology. It is as far from the mark as when, on another page, the Russians are called "descendants of Meshech, who represents the Scythians, sometimes called Sarmatians." "The Scythians," says Dean Milman, in a note to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*,¹⁶⁾ "even according to the ancients, were not Sarmatians." Schloezer, in his

14) W. Baudissin in *Herzog-Plitt*, Vol. 13, p. 642.

15) s. v. "Scyths."

16) Vol. I, p. 249.

Allgemeine Nordische Geschichte, has proved that the names Celts, Scythians, Sarmatians, "were invented by the profound geographical ignorance of the Greeks, and have no real ground; they are purely geographical divisions, without any relation to the true affiliation of the different races." ¹⁷⁾ Hence the partial identification of Russia with Meshech, based on Scythians = Sarmatians, falls to the ground. Moreover, there are scholars who maintain that everything that has ever been written about the origin of the Scythians is based on pure speculation. A writer in *MacClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia* ¹⁸⁾ admits the probability that the Scythians referred to in Ezek. 38 were Japhetic, but he is careful to say that "as a question of ethnology, the origin of the Scythians presents great difficulties. *Many eminent writers regard them as a Mongolian and therefore non-Japhetic race.*" If these scholars are right, then, according to the reasoning of the brochure before us, the Chinese are Magog, and Gog, the "prince in Magog," can in that case be no one else than Japan, which controls the destiny of the Mongol race!

The argument continues (p. 33):—

OTHER NATIONS IDENTIFIED.

"This does not preclude the fact that Tubalites, too, are a nation of Slavs. This is altogether probable. . . . Bochart, Michaelis, in fact, all modern scholars follow the ancient writers Strabo, Pliny, and Xenophon in interpreting Tubal (10, 2) as representing the Tibarenes, a people once located on the southeastern shore of the Black Sea. Josephus, on the other hand, speaks of the Iberenes, who inhabited the southern slope of the Caucasus. 'The Tibarenes south of the Black Sea and west of Colchis, whence they went to Spain, Sicily, etc.' (*Anal. Conc. to the Bible.*) It seems that Iberenes and Tibarenes are two different names for the same people. . . .

"The Spaniards in the Biblical view are essentially

17) *Op. cit.*, p. 289.

18) *s. v.* "Scythians."

Javanites; for Tarshish was the son of Javan. But this again does not prove that the Iberians, who in the early times occupied central and afterwards northern Spain, are not Tubalites. During later wars of conquest they were driven northward or into Portugal and partly exterminated. To-day we find possibly in Portugal a considerable portion, in Spain perhaps a small residue of the descendants of the Iberians, and these have long intermingled with Celtic or Gothic blood. . . . W. von Humboldt has shown that the ancient Iberians were a people who early settled in Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Spain, southwestern France, and in the British Isles. . . . Tubal, therefore, represents the original¹⁹⁾ inhabitants of the countries we mentioned. Of these countries Portugal and France by their treaties are under British control, and the others, more or less, under British influence. The same is true of Meshech, the Slav empire. Through an agreement Russia is bound to England, while Servia and Roumania tacitly bow to British pressure.”

The reasoning of our author here, again, is based on several doubtful assumptions. It is asserted that Tubal = Tibareni = Iberenes = Iberians = Spain, Portugal, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and part of France and England. Hence England = Gog.

The identification of Tubal with Tibareni is very probable, though we know as little of this people under one name as under the other. But the equation: Tibareni = Ibereni = Iberians is based upon fallacious reasoning. Some fifty years ago such easy generalizations were in style among ethnologists. But scientists have become much more careful as research expanded and deepened. As for the Iberians, Imm. Frohnmeyer says in his *Biblische Geographie* (1883) very distinctly: “The Iberians in Spain and Gaul have been wrongly identified with Tubal” (p. 334). Our author says that, according to Von Humboldt, the Basques, a nationality

19) In *Gog and His Defeat* sometimes the present “descendants” of the tribes in Ezek. 38 are adduced as evidence for the author’s thesis, then again the “original” inhabitants of a country are made to furnish an equation.

amounting to less than 500,000 souls and residing on the boundary of France and Spain, are a remnant of the ancient Iberians, and that this opinion is now "generally accepted." But this is not the case. Graslin and Blade have maintained against Von Humboldt that the "Iberians" never existed, that "Iberia" was only a Greek misnomer for Spain, and that the Basque people never occupied a wider area than at present! They termed the whole Basque-Iberian theory a "figment." To the present day scholars are divided on this question, some supporting Von Humboldt's view, others restricting the name "Iberian" to the cave-dwellers in Western Europe, who are classified by anthropologists according to the formation of their skull as belonging to the "Mediterranean Race."²⁰) This whole question evidently is involved in a bog of uncertainty.

The section dealing with "Meshech and Tubal" is summed up as follows:—

"The land of Magog is India. Gog, the ruler of India (the land of Magog), is England. Gog is also chief prince among the rulers of Meshech and Tubal. Meshech are the Slavic races, and Tubal the original inhabitants of England, France, Spain, Portugal, and the Italian isles of Sicily and Sardinia, who have mixed their blood with the later immigrants of these countries. England controls them all, either by treaty or by influence. Thus England is the chief prince among the rulers of Meshech and Tubal. England is Gog of whom Ezekiel prophesies."

Very interesting. Only, as we have seen, the investigator proceeds upon a series of assumptions, none of which are grounded in firm, historical evidence, and some of which are long-discarded theories dating from an age when ethnology was in great part guess-work based on faulty reasoning. But even if we, for the sake of argument, accepted these identifications of Meshech with the Russians, and of Tubal with the western Europeans, what would be gained thereby for the major thesis? Nothing, that we can

20) *International Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Iberians."

see. If the Meshech are Slavs, then what shall we say about the Slavonic groups fighting with the Central Powers: German Poles, Bohemians, Slovenians, Bulgarians, and the Ruthenians of Galicia and Hungary? Why are they not enrolled under the banner of Gog=England? And if Tubal=Iberians (??), then why is not Spain one of the leading allies of "Gog," instead of guarding her neutrality? (If "Iberian" pointed to any country, on the writer's hypothesis, it pointed to Spain.) And where does the chief ally of Great Britain, the United States, fit in, if this picture is true? Are we made up of Sarmatians and Scythians? The prophecy has woefully failed in historical emphasis, if it calls India Magog because a corner of it was once inhabited by Scythians, and if it gives more prominence to Portugal, Sardinia, and Sicily than to the United States, as allies of England. If the writer's interpretation is correct, why did he not establish in advance the entrance of the United States into the war?

But several identifications remain. There is Gomer. Who is Gomer? Page 37: "Gomer was progenitor of the Cimmerians, Cimbri, and other branches of the Celtic family. . . . After wandering through Asia Minor without settling anywhere, they turned toward western Europe, where they conquered the Iberians, part of whom were driven into Aquitania, in southern France, which was named Gaul. . . . The Celts dwelled partly in France and modern Belgium, partly in England, where they were known as Britons. . . . These facts furnish proof that the Gomer of our text is representing the Scots, the Irish, the Belgians, and a part of the French and the Gauls of upper Italy."

There is no valid objection to Gomer=Cimmerians=Cimbri. But the Cimbri inhabited parts of northern Germany. How does that fit into the theory that the allies of England are prefigured by Gog and his host?

Also, our author refers to the fact that the ancient Britons were Celts. This begins to look surprising. Gog is England, Tubal is England (see quotation above), also Gomer is England, because the Celts settled there. This

is indicative of some cardinal error in the ratiocination of *Gog and His Defeat*.

But Togarmah remains. Togarmah, we are told, is—Russia, because the “house of Togarmah” signifies Armenia, and the Armenians are, at least northern Armenia is, under the rule of Russia. This looks like skating on very thin ice. Because part of Armenia is (or was in 1915) under the rule of Russia, and because more than two thousand years ago there lived a tribe which *maybe* is represented by the Armenians, therefore “we conclude that the Russian troops from the uttermost parts of the north, perhaps from Siberia, of whose origin so little is known,²¹⁾ are related to the race” of Togarmah!

The chapter concludes: “All these nations are led by Gog (England). A mighty army indeed! The races mentioned by the prophet offer a united front against Germany, Austria, and Turkey. Thus the present war characterizes itself as fulfilling the prophecy of Ezekiel.”

But here Turkey is mentioned. Is not the question a natural one, Why, if the names in Ezekiel stand for modern nations, does not Turkey satisfy the searcher for a modern equivalent, based on original settlement or present racial distribution, for Togarmah? Armenia proper is now part of the Turkish Empire. But that would not fit into the hypothesis which makes Togarmah an ally of England.

THE BASIC ERROR.

That there is something basically wrong about this entire line of argument should have dawned upon the author when he noted that of the nations mentioned by Ezekiel, three are made to signify England (Gog, Tubal, and Gomer) and two Russia (Meshech and Togarmah), by the system of interpretation which he has adopted. This system consists in searching out the present representatives of the tribes referred to by Ezekiel, or the localities settled by them in

21) But Dr. Gray very confidently identifies Tubal with Tobolsk, part of Siberia!

some past age, and then drawing the conclusion, since these are all lined up with England, that England is Gog. But this method is based upon a monumental presumption, the presumption that it is *possible* to trace the origin of the races inhabiting the various civilized states to-day. This presumption, however, cannot be verified from the results of modern ethnological science. Time was when scientists believed that language was a reliable guide for the establishment of ethnological divisions. It is no longer so regarded to-day. As for "Aryan," a term employed with such confidence by our author, Max Mueller's warning appears to have been ignored: "'Aryan' in scientific language is utterly inapplicable to race; it means language and nothing but language."²²⁾ No anthropologist would in our day assume a blood-relationship, for instance, between the French, the Spanish, and the Portuguese, because their languages are so much alike. To speak plainly, scientists are completely at sea regarding the early history of the races now inhabiting Europe and Asia. Attempts have been made to classify the families of men according to physical peculiarities called "race characters": the color of the skin, eyes, hair; stature, proportion of limbs and trunk, conformation of the skull, the capacity of the cranium, relation of height to breadth, etc., and still, says the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*,²³⁾ "detailed anthropological research more and more justifies Blumenbach's words that 'innumerable varieties of mankind run into one another by insensible degrees.'" Man has been variously divided by scientists into 3, 5, 11, 15, and 16 races. The working out of the problem for such complex nations as those of Europe is now regarded as "a task of almost hopeless intricacy."²⁴⁾ Hence it is manifestly impossible to determine in which nations the descendants of the savage tribes of northern Asia Minor and western Central Asia, referred to by Ezekiel, preponderate to-day. We do not even know where the blood-

22) *Biographies of Words*, p. 90.

23) Vol. II, p. 113.

24) *Encycl. Brit.*, *ib.*

descendants of the Greeks and Romans of ancient history are found at the present time. The probability is that through the tremendous shifting of population during the early Middle Ages (the "migration of nations" period) all ancient demarcations of race have been obliterated, and that in every European country the descendants of the race inhabiting it previous to that age represent but a very small minority of the population. To trace the descendants of the Scythians, Sarmatians, and Armenians of Ezekiel's time down to the present age is about as hopeful a task as gathering the atoms of a sack of flour emptied into mid-ocean.

True, races do not utterly perish. Even as there is in many a gold coin which men handle to-day some small particle of gold mined in ancient Ophir or paid to Augustus Caesar as tribute money, so there are to be found in all modern nations elements which stand in blood-relation to races that have made their exit from the stage of history ages ago. But this rather tells against our author's hypothesis. For, if the basic principle of his brochure is correct, then all civilized nations of the world, including the Central Powers, are allies of Gog, since there are Celts, Slavs, and "Aryans" in every civilized country of Europe and America, not as mere "foreigners," either, but as component parts of the race. *Nihil probat, qui nimis probat*, here applies — "He proves nothing who proves too much."

Considerations of space forbid a detailed analysis of every chapter in the book before us. There are five more. The author believes that "God will personally conduct the war" against England and her allies, that after Gog's "crushing defeat" the Millennium will come, and that a "general conversion of heathen and Jews" will precede the Judgment. The millennial element, however, is not prominent in the book, which is mainly devoted to the task of proving that the "Israel" of Ezek. 38 and 39 is — Germany. The author correctly says, p. 42, that Israel in prophecy very frequently stands for the spiritual people of God, and that the true Israel is not confined to a certain country. But this is limited page 44 as follows: "The 'land of Israel' is the

country in which the people are true to God and obey His holy commandments." This is a fatal departure from the spiritual meaning which the author has previously established for "Israel." "Which, then," he asks, "is the true land of Israel?" "The land of Israel are the countries against which Gog is going to war: Germany and Austria." Turkey is omitted, why? Because a Mohammedan country cannot by any figure of speech be called "true people of God." This omission in itself shows the fatal flaw of the theory. Nor can we accept the author's justification of "Israel" = "Germany and Austria." He says: "The reason why these countries represent the house of Israel is their spiritual condition. Germany is the land of the Reformation; in no other country has the Gospel been preached as truly and fully since the days of the apostles. And while it is true that Catholicism, too, is represented in Germany, and especially in Austria, we know that even among these Catholics we find a spiritual Israel." This, again, is proving a great deal too much. God surely has His chosen people also among the Catholics of Italy, Belgium, and France, not to speak of the churches of the British Isles. The author makes scant allowance for this, however. He holds that "the devil ruled the world through England a thousand years," and that the missionary activity of England, in general, may be described as "making proselytes twofold more the child of hell than themselves"! (p. 82.) Thus is the glorious missionary record of England depressed for the sake of a theory, even as Germany is unduly exalted when it is made representative of God's people on earth. There are good Christians wherever the Gospel is preached, in England and Germany, as well as in Austria, Russia, or the United States. But the Christians in all countries constitute such a small minority that no nation can be termed the "people of God" in any such sense. Surely, there has been a very destructive influence exerted by Germany upon the complexion of Christianity in all lands for many years before the war.

In one instance the author attempts to predict the future.

on the basis of his interpretation, and fails. He believes that the last verses of Ezek. 38 "seem to indicate that England will not succeed in gaining more allies than she has gained so far, and that, should she succeed in doing so, none of them would be able to help her. Also, they seem to suggest that Germany and her allies will receive some reinforcements." Wrong in both cases: Germany has gained no new allies, and England has certainly been helped by the accession of the United States, not to speak of Brazil, China, and other countries.

INTERESTING RESULT OF COMBINING TWO METHODS.

As has been noted before, the entrance of the United States into the war has played havoc with many an interpretation of prophecy. However, our Chiliasts are never at a loss to adjust their theories to the changes in the situation which they seek to interpret. Nor do we see why the entrance of the United States into the great conflict should stagger the interpreters of Ezek. 38. Before long we shall be told that this event, far from upsetting their calculations, most beautifully confirms them. They cannot fail to observe that by combining the systems of interpretation which we have now considered, it can be conclusively shown that the United States is Gog of Ezek. 38. According to the method explained by Dr. Gray in the *Christian Herald* (Rosh = Russia, Meshech = Moscow, Tubal = Tobolsk), it is an easy matter to prove that Magog must be the "mother of Gog," for MA is an ancient Aryan root, which signifies "mother";²⁵⁾ now, since England is Magog, and since Magog means "mother of Gog," *ergo* the daughter country, the United States, must be Gog. Following up this valuable clue, and employing the method of Dr. Gray, it readily develops that "Rosh" is the first half of Roosevelt, whose anti-German influence is well known. In that case it follows that the

25) Alois Vanicek, *Etymologisches Woerterbuch*, p. 648. Aug. Fick, *Vergleichendes Woerterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. I, p. 165.

"prince of Rosh," his superior, is Mr. Wilson. In "Persia," who is "with them" (v. 5), we discover General Pershing, and Ethiopia, in the same verse, is a reference to our colored troops. Gomer is readily understood as a reference to Mr. Gompers, who leads the hosts of labor. A little further research will easily identify Togarmah and the rest. "Preposterous," you say. Yes, but no more preposterous than the identifications of Dr. Gray, Dr. Gaebelein, and *Gog and His Defeat*.

As soon as Norway and Sweden enter the war, another slight adjustment will become necessary, but we are prepared for it; a cross-reference takes us to Daniel 11, where there are enough "kings of the North" to satisfy any Chiliast.

WHAT IS "GOG AND MAGOG"?

Enough has been said to show that anything and everything can be "proven" by the methods of Chiasm. Besides, the prophecy concerning Gog and Magog, if taken literally, involves us in a maze of contradictions and absurdities. It is impossible to take "Israel" literally as meaning "Jews," because 1) in that case Ezekiel would teach not one, but two "restorations" of Israel, for not only chap. 37, 22 ff., before the campaign of Gog, but also chap. 39, 28, after that onslaught, Israel is represented as living peacefully in Palestine. 2) In that case "Gog, Magog, Meshech, Tubal," and the rest would have to be taken in a literal sense, which is impossible, because none of these nations exist to-day. Nowhere is it indicated that the *descendants* of these tribes are referred to by the prophet. 3) If the nations in Ezek. 38 are to be understood literally, then why not their weapons: shields, bucklers, bows, and arrows? But does any Chiliast believe that the armies of Russia, of which some speak in this connection, are going to discard rifles, machine-guns, and shrapnel, and revert to bows and arrows? Again, let us be consistent. If one statement is taken in a literal sense, then why not the other? 4) The notion that the Jews dwelling in Palestine will be attacked by actual military forces, as our Chiliasts believe, made up of Russia, Germany,

Persia, Armenia, and a great part of Africa, and that this great drive will be aimed against a helpless people, a country without defenses, is so ridiculous that no thinking person should entertain the thought even for a minute. An army of less than 10,000 men could sweep all Palestine from end to end if it were a land of "unwalled villages," as Ezekiel describes the country of God's people, chap. 38, 11. And Chiliasts expect us to believe that this land of undefended villages will be attacked by a modern army of ten millions of fighters gathered from every part of the world (Rev. 20, 8); and these — *armed with bows and arrows*.

Let us leave the Chiliast interpreters of Ezek. 38 and 39 here. Undoubtedly, the campaign of Gog and Magog must be understood in a figurative, spiritual sense, like most Old Testament prophecies. Verse 17 in chapter 38 gives us the clue. In such words as Joel 3, 9; Is. 25; Jer. 30, 20; Micah 4, 11, and many others, there is a clear reference to the same struggle described by Ezekiel in the stupendous imagery of Gog and Magog. Especially from Rev. 20 it is clear that Gog and Magog are not a certain tribe or nation, but stand for the hosts of evil, led by Satan, which assail the New Testament Israel from every side. In Ezekiel's day the Scythians of the North and East were a terror to the whole Oriental world. Herodotus reports an invasion of Scythians which spread destruction all through western Asia, also through Palestine, about 630 B. C., or within the memory of men living in Ezekiel's time. "With the memory of these events yet fresh in the minds of his countrymen, Ezekiel seems to select the Scythians under the name Gog, as the symbol of the earthly violence arrayed against the people of God."²⁶⁾ In addition to the fierce Scythians are mentioned the savages of Ethiopia and Libya (Africa). To the Jews who first read this prophecy, all these dreadful hordes on the outer margin of the known world represented a symbol for nameless terror, fierce and merciless onslaught, destructive, barbaric power. Such were the attacks to be to which

26) MacClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, s. v. "Scythians."

Israel in the last days, in the Gospel-age, was to be exposed. Undoubtedly, Israel here stands for the Christian Church, as it does so frequently in prophecy. Nor must it appear strange that the names of then existing tribes are used in a figurative meaning for "enemies of the Church." Even so the name of Edom, the ancient enemy of Israel, is used by Isaiah (chaps. 34 and 63) as a symbol of the enmity of the world against the Church. In the same sense the Prophet Joel employs the names of Edom and of Egypt. As Judah, Israel, Jacob, are used as symbols of the Christian Church, so Edom and Egypt as symbols of the unbelieving mass of humanity. Why, then, should the fierce Scythian hordes in the gloomy and untraveled North and the savages of the Southland not stand for the forces arrayed in the world against the Church of God? Again, in Dan. 11, 41 Edom, Moab, and Ammon, related with Israel by descent, and the old hereditary and chief enemies of this people, "have become by name representatives of all the hereditary and chief enemies of the people of God." (Keil.) It is very clear that what Daniel foretells in this chapter belongs to a far, distant era. However, the nation Moab no longer existed after the time of the Babylonian exile, in the sixth century before Christ. Yet the Moabites appear in this prophecy as future enemies of the Christian Church! The symbolism here cannot be assailed. But if "Moab," "Edom," "Ammon," are used as symbols for the world's hatred against the Christian Church, then why not Gog, Magog? As for "land of Israel," the entire earth, so far as it is inhabited by Christians, has become a Holy Land, a Canaan. To Abraham was given the promise that he should be heir of the world (Rom. 4, 9—13), and this is fulfilled in the spread of Christianity to all countries. Wherever the Church is, there is the spiritual Canaan.

The campaign of Gog and Magog, then, is the onset of hostile powers under the leadership of Satan against the Christian Church, "in the latter years," in the age of the Gospel. Luther believed that Gog and Magog are the Turk, who gathered his adherents in western Asia and Africa for

campaigns against western Europe, which came near succeeding more than once. The "terrible Turk" certainly bears close similarity, also in externals, to the fierce hordes led by Gog; there is a kind of family resemblance. Indeed, if any one wishes to identify the attempts of Mohammedanism to destroy Christian civilization in the sixteenth century with the campaign of Gog, not much can be urged against this interpretation. But even when we accept the larger view, in which Gog stands for *all* the various forms under which Satanic hatred has striven to crush the people of God, that would certainly include the Turkish wars in Luther's time. Gog is "omnis turba impiorum et hostium ecclesiae," "any and every host of wicked enemies assailing the Church," says old Starck back in 1731, and he includes the Turk specifically as *one* of the forms in which Satan summoned the evil forces resident in humanity against the Church of God. Whatever is in league to-day against the Christian Church — anti-Christian scientific speculation, higher criticism, the New Theology, New Thought, Mormonism, Eddyism; materialism, sensualism, secretism, birth-control, all the forces of Sin and Carnality which seek to corrupt the Church and to slay her inner life, are the "Gog and Magog" of Ezekiel and John. But the Great Day of the Lord is even now approaching, which will witness their irrevocable doom. "Upon 'Gog and Magog,' the anti-Christian masses within the Church and the world, whose number is as the sand of the sea, and whom Satan gathers upon the breadth of the earth for the fray against the Saints and the Beloved City, the Holy Christian Church, soon will fall the fire of Judgment Day, and devour them, Rev. 20, 8. 9." 27)

27) Rev. C. M. Zorn in *Der Lutheraner*.

Chapter 5.

The Days and Years of Prophecy.

Has the war been foretold?

Many have answered the question affirmatively, but none with greater assurance than the *time-setting* group of Chiliasts. "Time-setting" has long been an accepted term applied to the occupation of certain interpreters of Scripture who seek to establish significant dates of modern history as prophesied in the Bible. It has been a specialty of the Seventh-day Adventists ever since that sect took its rise, and has of late been a field industriously worked by the Russellites (Millennial Dawn people).

A Russellite tract recently distributed, "The Great War Will End When? And What Then?" proceeds upon the assumption that "the second chapter of Daniel will reveal not only when the present war will end, but, also, what will happen afterwards, until 1927, within the territory embraced in the warring nations." The author starts with a reference to the manifest probability that the war cannot last much longer than some time in 1918, and then seeks to fit this date into his interpretation of Dan. 2. He takes the "stone" that smote the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream to signify Socialism, which will "fill the whole earth," when the image (according to Russell and his followers, the governments of our time) will be destroyed. However, he believes that this breaking-up will be a slow process. When does that process commence? The author fixes on the date 1878. He writes: "In that year Bismarck at length succeeded, after several years of effort, in securing the passage by the German Reichstag of severe laws against the Socialists. Acting under these laws, he began to wage a war of extermination against Socialism, fining and imprisoning speakers and editors advocating it, confiscating its newspapers and their plants, etc. That year the Socialists had elected ten members of the German Reichstag, or Congress. The prophecies, as the writer interprets them, proceed to give a brief outline of

the history of Socialism until the year 1925, probably 1972, as we will show hereafter."

He proceeds to demonstrate his theory, thus:—

"Now as to the date when this prophecy is to be fulfilled. At the end of each epoch, or age, there is an overlapping period of forty years of preparation, then of seven years of effecting the final change from one epoch to another; active clearing of the old and building up of the new."

What evidence does the writer give for this interesting law of interpretation? Just a single instance is cited: Israel wandered forty years in the wilderness, and then was six years fighting to conquer Canaan, then rested the seventh. On this single instance he builds with calm assurance the law that in Bible chronology there are always forty-year periods, followed by seven years for "effecting the final change"! This manner of generalizing upon isolated facts is typical of the "time-setters'" method. However, where did this author get his six-year period of conquest and the year of rest? The Bible contains no such statement, nor any that can be "interpreted" thus. Just pure Russellite fiction! But let us read on:—

"The language used in the prophecies was mostly symbolical; a 'day' standing for a year²⁸⁾; a 'week,' seven years; a 'month,' thirty years; a 'time,' 360 years; 'times,' 720 years; a 'half-time,' 180 years; 'mountain' for kingdom, etc. Now the Jewish age being a type of the Gospel-age, they ought to be, and are, of the same length. From Jacob's death, when the Jewish dispensation began²⁹⁾ with the rule of his twelve sons, to A. D. 33, when the Jewish age ended and the Gospel-church began (with the sending out of the twelve apostles to preach), was 1845 years. Now, to find the end of the Gospel-age or -church, to A. D. 33 add 1845 years, and we have A. D. 1878, when the stone cut out of

28) Another bare assertion, given without a scintilla of proof from the Scriptures.

29) The Jewish dispensation began with the calling of Abraham, not with the death of Jacob.

the mountain, Christian Socialism, was to begin breaking in pieces the feet of the image as we have stated above. Then add the forty-year period of waiting and preparation to 1878, and we have 1918, as the time when the six years of actual clearing away of the present government and business systems of Europe should begin. By that time the present war in Europe should be ended with a treaty of peace. Reasonably, by that time, one or the other side should be so thoroughly exhausted that they would be willing to make peace on the terms of the other party. At that time the seven-year period of Socialism should begin; six years of fighting and struggle to clear away the present governments and industrial and financial systems. . . . The seventh year, 1925, is to be spent in the celebration of the jubilee of jubilees, or the 70th and the last jubilee; by canceling all debts, dividing up the possession of the land and all natural resources, and so organizing society and the industries cooperatively as to provide an abundance of the comforts of life with a minimum of work."

You see it works out. Only, the entire argument is built on unproven assertions: That the "great stone" in Dan. 2 is Socialism (every thoughtful Bible-reader finds here a distinct reference to the Kingdom of Grace, the Christian Church), that there are in sacred history always forty-year periods with a subsequent period of seven years, that the Jewish dispensation began with the death of Jacob, and that the New Testament dispensation will be limited to an equal number of years. Unprovable statements, all.

But the date 1925 is also established by another line of "proof." Our author continues:—

"The year 1925 also seems pointed out as a great jubilee of jubilees, which will be celebrated all over the earth as the 70th and last jubilee. From 2 Chron. 36, 17--21; Dan. 9, 2, it appears there were to be just 70 jubilees. The Jews celebrated the 19th jubilee 625 years before Christ, leaving 51 to come afterward. 51 jubilees equal 51×50 , or 2,550 years. Subtract from this number the 625 B. C., and we

have 1925 A.D. as the year when the last jubilee is to be celebrated.”

If the reader will now turn to the passages in Chronicles and Daniel, he will find that the reference is there to the seventy years of the Babylonian captivity. Not one word about the Old and New Testament Gospel-age's being limited to 70×50 years! By a similar misuse of arithmetic the author then proves that the Jewish socialist state will be set up in 1927, that Israel will be converted in 1944, and that the Millennium will come in 1972.

We should seriously overestimate the religious value of such figuring of dates if we believed that these “time-setters” are started on their arithmetical ravings by the cogency of certain “laws” of spiritual interpretation which they have “discovered” by intense application to the Bible. The process is just the reverse. A certain result is aimed at from the outset. The war is evidently drawing to a close, and Socialism will (??) then rule the world. Now, how find some prophetic reference to this probable turn of things, in order to bolster up the Russellite faith? We must find some figures which will fit. Paper, pencil, concordance, Daniel, Chronicles, Jacob's death, add, multiply, — there you are! Wonderful! Rather, let us say, a disgraceful abuse of the inspired Word of God. Paul writes to Titus: “Avoid foolish questions, *genealogies*, . . . for they are unprofitable and vain.”

Of all attempts to demonstrate a connection between the war and prophecy, H. C. Williams's *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, A Study of the Apocalypse*, is the most comprehensive. It is a book of 370 pages, in which the author endeavors to prove that “1914 A.D. is the time-limit set in the Scripture for the occurrence of the war; that the war broke out and continues in all details as described by the prophets; that it is a complete fulfilment of the prophetic record.” As a time-setting extravaganza Mr. Williams's book is without a parallel in chiliastic literature. He is busy setting times from the beginning of John's Book of Revelation to the end, pointing out dates in every century of the

Christian era as fulfilments of John's visions. We are interested only in the references which this volume contains to the Great War. How does the author attempt to prove his proposition that the exact date 1914 was revealed in prophecy as the opening year of the struggle?

He begins with a reference to — Nebuchadnezzar's madness!!

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S MADNESS.

The story is familiar to Bible-readers. Nebuchadnezzar, ruler of the Babylonian empire, boasts of the greatness of his imperial city, and is struck with madness by the Lord for his presumptuous folly; Daniel, chapter four. This period of insanity lasted "seven times," verse 32. Of this phrase, "seven times," the duration of Nebuchadnezzar's madness, our author says that it signifies "the time when the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ." Now, if this utterly absurd statement had been made *by Nebuchadnezzar* while his reason was dethroned, we should not consider it strange. But that a man presumably in his right mind can gather this information from the simple fact that in Nebuchadnezzar's dream an indefinite number, "seven times," is used, — of which to-day no man can say whether it meant seven days, or weeks, or months, or years, — surely demonstrates the strength of the Chiliast delusion. Let the reader turn to Daniel 4, and decide for himself whether there is the slightest ground for this interpretation in Daniel's *divinely inspired interpretation* of the dream! But to this untenable hypothesis Mr. Williams adds another, in order to arrive at his conclusion. He says, "seven times" means 2,520 years. How does he get it? By multiplying 360 days by seven! He figures his 2,520 years, as do the Russellites, from 606 B. C., "the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign." But the date is wrong. Nebuchadnezzar succeeded to the throne in 604. But what are two years — we must get the date 1914! And what warrant is there in the Scriptures for taking "seven times" in the sense of "7×360"? However, warrant or not, the Chiliast now has smooth sailing.

"From the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (606 B. C.) seven times, or (!) 2,520 years, will intervene before the stone begins to crush the kingdoms which are represented by the toes of the image. This establishes 1914 A. D. as the year in which the crushing process begins, and determines the meaning of the struggle in which the European nations are engaged. They are being ground to powder, and they, with all Gentile governments, will disappear as chaff of the summer threshing-floors."

But there is another line of proof. In Leviticus, chapter 26, verses 18 and 28, we read that the Lord will punish the Israelites "seven times more for their sins if they will not hearken unto Him." All sane Bible-readers will understand these words simply as they are written: there will be heavier and heavier punishments for Israel if it continues in unbelief.³⁰⁾ Our Chiliast, however, detects that those "seven times" signify "seven years," and that in these "years" every day is to be taken for a year, hence 7×365 years. But this would not furnish the date required by the author's hypothesis, so he shortens the year by five days and multiplies $7 \times 360 = 2,520$ years. He establishes upon this basis the date 1914 as the end of the "Gentile Period." How does he get the date? Figuring from the year of Israel's captivity in Babylon,³¹⁾ in 606 B. C., 2,520 years onward, gives A. D. 1914, when the "Beginning of the End of Gentile Nations" is at hand. In this way Mr. Williams tries to make good his assertion that "the war broke out and continues in all details as described by the prophets," and that "it is a complete fulfilment of the prophetic record." By similar means the author establishes the year 1923 as the date when

30) The Hebrew text *does not contain the word "time,"* but simply the numeral seven (שֶׁבַע), literally translated: "seven-fold," "siebenmal"; the English language has no adverb "seven-foldly," but instead has the phrase "seven times."

31) But where does Lev. 26, 18 say that this date should be the basis of this or any other figuring? And how does he fix the date of the Captivity as 606?

the papacy will "experience a great convulsion," the year 1934 as the time for the "final influx of the Jews to the land of their fathers," and the year 1972 for the Millennium.

But ought not this confident establishment of prophetic years, after all, possess some claim upon the attention of devout Bible Christians? Yes, inasmuch as it will definitely cure them of any chiliastic tendencies. Chiliasm appeals to some Christians because their Old Adam is flattered by the prospect of earthly glory, even as Salome approached the Lord with the request that her two sons might sit at His right and left hand in the Kingdom. She was a millennialist, as were most of the Jews in Jesus' time. They expected a Messianic kingdom of outward, earthly splendor, and because these millennialist expectations³²⁾ were shattered by the Savior, they crucified Him as a false Messiah. What did the Lord answer Salome? He answered and said: "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" His words are plain. *Through suffering* to glory, that is the Way of Life. But suffering is contrary to the desires of the flesh. We would have our Kingdom of Glory here below. And while there have been Chiliasts of devout Christian mind, yet it is very clear that the chiliastic idea has so strong a hold upon many church-members because their flesh, with its earthly and temporal yearnings, welcomes the notion of a thousand years of abounding earthly happiness for the followers of the humble Christ.

But there is also for simple Bible Christians, yes, for them in a special sense, an appeal to their reverence for the Word of God in the arguments which are employed with such skill by millennialists. Do not these men, also "Pastor" Russell's followers and the Adventist deceivers, claim a special regard for the "inviolable," "inspired Word of God"? They say: "We are the true Bible Christians; we accept every statement in the Old and New Testaments as divinely

32) Of course, a period of 1,000 years was never an element in their chiliastic dreams.

inspired; and for this reason the Holy Spirit has given us special powers of insight, and has revealed to us the things of the future, so plainly taught in the sacred scroll." We know that many Christians are drawn into the Russellite and Adventist sects just by such appeals to their reverence for the Word of God.

And there is one other thought which causes many to give heed to the claims of the time-setting profession. It is this: If these men were not right in their calculations, how could they dare to announce with such definiteness certain events to come to pass in a certain year? Will they not be disgraced before the Christian world and lose their entire following when the events predicted do not come to pass?

THE STRENGTH OF THE "TIME-SETTING" DELUSION.

Now, in both these assumptions the questioning Christian is wrong. Neither do the "time-setters" give honor to the Word of God, nor does the prospect or possibility of failure discourage them from employing systems of interpretation which

- 1) lead to contradictory results, which
- 2) have failed ignominiously in the past, and which
- 3) are without the least warrant in Holy Scriptures.

I. The principles adopted by "time-setters" lead to contradictory results, hence are not a reliable guide to the study of prophecy.

Proceeding on the supposition that a day signifies a year, and, that in the term "seven times" (Lev. 26) there are hidden 7×360 years, Dr. R. C. Shimeall, of New York, in a volume of 239 pages octavo, proved that the Millennium would come in 1868. He arrived at this date because "in 652 B. C. Manasseh was taken prisoner"!! How the text in Lev. 26 can be made to refer to the exile of Manasseh passes comprehension. But the same result — the ushering in of the Millennium in 1868 — was arrived at by Dr. Shimeall by computing the years indicated by the madness of Nebuchadnezzar. Now observe that Mr. Williams in *The Revelation*

of *Jesus Christ* employs the same mode of computation, but arrives at the date 1972 for the Millennium. We remember, too, that "Pastor" Russell, proceeding on the same interpretation of Lev. 26, foretold the Millennium for 1914.

We conclude that a system of computation which leads to such contradictory results cannot be based upon the intended meaning of the passages in Leviticus and Daniel.

II. All chiliastic predictions made in the past have failed. The Millennium did not come in 1837, as foretold by Bengel, nor in 1843, nor 1844, nor 1845, nor 1850, nor 1857, nor 1863, nor 1877, nor 1896, nor any subsequent date set by the Seventh-day Adventists, nor in 1868, as foretold by Dr. Shimeall, nor in 1914. Nor has any other event predicted by Chiliasts ever occurred within the limits of time set by their chronological figuring. When they attempted to foretell the future, they have always failed.

But our arithmetical interpreters of the Scriptures have another string to their bow. They lay great stress upon the fact that their method of figuring dates is shown to be correct by the exactness with which it works out when applied to past history. Dr. Shimeall, writing in 1853, discovers that Daniel, by his 1,260 "years," (?) foretold the end of the French Revolution in 1793, that the same number gives the date 1823, when Lord Russell effected the emancipation of the Catholics in England, that in 1820 the Greek insurrection broke out, that the Turks took Constantinople in 1453, and that all these dates can be found in the prophets. Similarly Mr. Williams, in his interpretation of the Book of Revelation, discovers a great number of dates, scattered through the Christian era, as having been foretold in John's visions. The conclusion is inviting: If the system can be applied with such success to events of the past, the arithmetical system of reading the Scriptures cannot be all wrong, and if *errors* have been made with reference to the Millennium, the conversion of the Jews, the collapse of the papacy, etc., the system as such cannot be condemned, because, forsooth, it works out with reference to the past. This matter is worth some detailed consideration. For,

granted that the method itself is not objectionable, there might be a presumption in favor of the belief that before long some one will find the lucky combination, and actually predict, on the basis of Biblical prophecy, the outcome of the World War and subsequent developments in the history of the world and of the Christian Church.

Now let us look into some of these claims a little more closely. Dr. Shimeall said that his system was proven trustworthy because it worked out correctly, for instance, with reference to the occurrence of the Greek insurrection in 1820, just the year in which it had to come to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel. Now, Dr. Shimeall dated his years from 481 B. C., because in that year, the year of Xerxes' "setting out from Susa," a "famous eclipse of the sun" occurred. But Dr. Seyffarth has conclusively shown that in 481 B. C. no eclipse of the sun was visible, and that Xerxes left Susa, not in 481, but one year earlier; hence the corresponding year was not 1820 but 1819, when there was no insurrection in Greece! Of course, the difference of a single year overthrows the arithmetical value of the interpretations, since arithmetic is arithmetic, in which all values are constant. Either the exact date must be the arithmetical result, or there is no *arithmetical* result; in other words, the system is based on guess-work. Again, Dr. Shimeall predicted the return of the Jews for 1868. How was this demonstrated? "In the year 652 B. C., Manasseh was taken prisoner and carried into captivity; add to these 652 years 2,520, and you will see that the Millennial Sabbath must begin in the year 1868 A. D." The only question is whether Manasseh was really taken prisoner in 652 B. C., "the twenty-second year of this king." He was not. The twenty-second year of Manasseh corresponded, according to both the Hebrew text and the Septuagint, when strictly followed, with the year 675 B. C., and hence the "seven times," according to Dr. Shimeall's interpretation, expired in 1845, in which year, however, the Jews were not "nationally restored"! In all this there is no evidence that the system which we are investigating actually works out when applied to the past.

THE FATE OF TURKEY.

A Seventh-day Adventist, Arthur G. Daniells, has written a book on *The World War: Its Relation to the Eastern Question and Armageddon*. He foretells, at least asserts the strong probability, that "the sword will not be sheathed until Constantinople, the Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles pass from Turkey into the hands of some other greater power or combination of powers." Now, this is not much of a prediction to make. Thousands of observers, who base their prognostications merely upon the newspaper reports of the war, have guessed as much. However, Mr. Daniells believes that Turkey's future may be calculated with some degree of certainty from the sacred Scriptures, since in time past certain events in the history of that country came as a fulfilment of prophecy, even as to the dates. According to his reading of Daniel's and John's prophecies, there was a close interconnection between the dates which signified the downfall of the papacy and the victory of the Turkish arms over France. The evident conclusion to be drawn by the reader is, that, since the method of reading prophecy adopted by the author has been applied successfully to events in the past history of Turkey, there is a presumption in favor of its correctness when applied to the future. In other words, if the dates "come out" correctly for events that occurred a century ago, then, why should they not "come out" with reference to the Great War, according to the same method of interpreting the prophets?

But how does Mr. Daniells substantiate his claim for the correctness of his chronological figuring? His starting-point is the eleventh chapter of Daniel's prophecies. In the closing part of that chapter is foretold a bitter conflict between the king of the north and the king of the south, and another power that was to make war against them. Mr. Daniells believes that the "time of the end," there referred to, is not the New Testament Age, but must date from the year 1798, "the final limit of the period in which the papacy exercised its supremacy. This prophetic period of twelve hundred and sixty years is to be reckoned from

the issuance, in 533, of Justinian's decree recognizing the Pope as 'the head of all the churches,' and the events culminating in 538, when Vigilius 'ascended the papal chair under the military protection of Belisarius.' It would accordingly extend to 1798, when the Pope was taken prisoner, marking the close of that series of events which constituted the giving of the deadly wound to the papacy and the bringing to an end the allotted period of supremacy over the souls and bodies of men.

"In the year 1798 France began the conquest of Egypt and Turkey, thus precipitating a war attended by results most pathetic and terrible. Egypt resisted.—'pushed at him,' v. 40,—but was conquered. Turkey's fate, however, was different. Turkey triumphed over the armies of France, and overflowed and passed over, just as the prophecy said would be done. The full history of the invasions, the resistances, the victories, and the defeats of that war which began in 1798, meets every specification of the prophecy, and this is the only history of nations that answers to these predictions."

The application is then made:—

"The sword has been drawn; and, judging from the avowed purpose of the nations, it looks as if it will never be sheathed until Constantinople, Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles pass from Turkey into the hands of some other greater power or combination of powers."

We observe:—

1) The expression "time of the end" is throughout the Old and New Testaments consistently used, like "latter days," "end of days," for the Gospel-age, extending from the birth of Jesus to the Day of Judgment. If Mr. Daniells departs from this meaning of the term, it is because he brings preconceived notions to the text, namely, that the prophet points out a definite period of time, and that this period is the 1,260 "years of papal dominion."

2) Mr. Daniells says that the supremacy of the Popes must be dated from 538, more exactly, from 533. However, the first imperial decree recognizing the Pope as the head

of all the churches is much earlier than 533. The primacy of the Popes was first recognized in the law of Gratianus of the year 375. This error in Mr. Daniells's calculation really upsets his entire hypothesis.

3) Mr. Daniells believes that the imprisoning of the Pope in 1798 "constituted the giving of the deadly wound to the papacy" and the bringing to an end "the allotted period of the supremacy over the bodies and souls of men." But he again misreads history. The imprisonment of Clement XIV created barely a ripple in the history of the papacy. The "deadly wound" was inflicted in the early sixteenth century by Martin Luther.

4) The history of Napoleon's Egyptian campaign does not "meet every specification of the prophecy." Dan. 11. 40 ("push at him") speaks of an offensive war and not of a defense against invasion, and hence does not at all correspond to the resistance which Egypt offered to Napoleon.

We conclude that the case based on the "fulfilment" of Daniel's prophecy in 1798 does not bear critical analysis. Hence there is no presumption in favor of the hypotheses set forth in *The World War: Its Relation to the Eastern Question and Armageddon*. The method of interpretation employed finds no justification whatever when applied to the earlier stages of the Eastern Question.

CAMPBELLITE DEFIES SCRIPTURE, HISTORY, AND COMMON SENSE.

Mr. Williams's *Revelation of Jesus Christ* with great assurance predicts another world-wide war among the nations in 1921 and the downfall of the Gentile nations in 1934, on the basis of Lev. 26, 14. He foretells the "death-stroke to the papacy" for 1926 A. D., the "death-stroke to Turkey" for 1927, and the Millennium for 1972. And in proof of these calculations he points out the accurate fulfilment of prophecy, when interpreted from the same point of view and applied to the events of the past. Mr. Williams, too, bases his calculations on the assumption that "1,260 years" is the period of the papacy. As all his predictions with

reference to the World War are dovetailed to the arithmetical system based on this meaning of the "1,260 days" of Rev. 11, 3 and 12, 6, it is essential to our argument that we observe how this system works out with reference to specific events of the past which he adduces as proof. In the first place, we note with some amazement that the author, who is a Campbellite, finds the origin of his sect prophetically announced in Revelation. How does he go about it? Let us attend. Mr. Williams's theory is that the beginning of the 1,260 days must be sought in the centuries in which the papacy took its rise: the end of the 1,260 days (which he interprets as "years") will then be found to mark a corresponding epoch of decline. He says (p. 224): "From 312 A. D., the beginning of the campaign of Constantine, to 1572 A. D., the year of the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, is 1,260 years. From the crushing defeat of his enemies administered by Constantine in 315 A. D., to the edict of pacification with the Protestants in 1575 A. D., is 1,260 years. It will be seen, therefore, that from every important event in the development of the papacy there extends a period of 1,260 years until a corresponding important event in the destruction of the papacy."

We might well ask: But did the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Night, when some 30,000 French Protestants were murdered by the Catholics, indicate a period of papal decline? If anything, that event showed the tyranny which it still exercised over the thoughts of nations and rulers. And in what sense can Constantine's victory in 315 be regarded as a step in the development of the Roman bishop's pretensions? However, the sense of the passage is clear. The author believes that there are always just 1,260 years between cardinal events in the history of Rome's rise and decline. But do the dates so obtained reveal any such significance? Look closely, and you will observe that neither the years from which Mr. Williams dates his periods, nor the dates at which he arrives, mark really epochal events. Read this (p. 225): —

"In 663 A. D. Vitalianus enjoined the exclusive use of the Latin tongue in religious worship throughout Christen-

dom. The effect of this edict was to unify the religious world, and finally establish the world dominance of the papacy through a body having a common religious speech. In 1923 A. D., therefore, will occur the greatest convulsion which has thus far shaken the papacy.”

That the universal use of the Latin language (a matter of gradual growth) had the effect of slowly unifying the Roman Church, who would deny? But does any one mean to say that the edict of the insignificant ruler Vitalianus had any decisive effect on the use of the Latin tongue in worship? The decree of Vitalianus was a very obscure document, of which no church-history that we have examined makes any mention. Now observe how this same principle of interpretation is used in order to point out the prophetic significance of the rise of Campbellism (p. 191 f.):—

“Among the Methodists, James O’Kelly led a movement against the prevailing Episcopal form of government. The Episcopal devotees were so strong that O’Kelly and his followers were compelled to withdraw, and on Christmas Day, 1793, at Manakin Town, North Carolina, a congregation was established with the New Testament as its only discipline. The church was measured by the New Testament ‘reed.’ They called themselves ‘Christians.’” (In the next paragraph the connection of Alexander Campbell with this movement is pointed out. Our author continues:) “The significant feature of this movement of O’Kelly is the date upon which the standards were applied. In 533 A. D., Justinian, Roman Emperor, issued a decree constituting the bishop of Rome ‘Head of all the Holy Churches and of all the Holy Priests of God.’ This marked a long step in advance in the establishment of the papacy and the treading down the Church of Christ, or the ‘Holy City.’ Exactly forty-two prophetic months, or 1,260 years, elapsed until 1793 A. D., when the ‘reed’ was used to measure the church.”

The thoughtful reader must notice that both dates, the beginning as well as the end of the epoch, are devoid of any significance, either for the papacy or for the Church of our age. The decree of Justinian by no means “constituted”

the bishop of Rome head of the Church. For 1) the bishop of Rome had long since arrogated to himself that position, and 2) it was Justinian who *deposed* two Popes, Silverius and Vigilius! As for O'Kelly's movement, what kind of a magnifying power of sectarian conceit does it not argue when a professed expounder of the Scriptures can maintain that this insignificant movement in a corner of North Carolina, which was not at all the beginning of a new epoch in Christianity, but a rivulet which helped swell a recent sect, has been foretold by the Holy Spirit through the Apostle John!

Now, the entire hypothesis of the author, so far as it touches the present war, is based upon calculations which stand and fall with the arithmetical correctness of the examples he adduces. Like most Chiliasts, Mr. Williams is forced to establish wrong dates for well-known events. In order to have his figures come out straight, he makes 1518 the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation. He makes the papacy originate in 666, because then a Pope commanded the use of the Latin tongue throughout the world; however, Mr. Williams admits that the *exact* date is 663. Even so, the papacy can be traced to an age which antedates 663 by almost 300 years. History is falsified in the interest of the same hypothesis, when (p. 198) the Pope is made responsible for the abrogating of religious worship by the French revolutionaries in 1793. Here, it is said, Rome "rallied the hosts of infidelity to its aid." The author actually expects his readers to believe that the Pope in 1793 caused his churches in France to be turned over to the atheistic worship of Reason inaugurated by the Hebertists!

Almost anything can be proved by a system which ignores plain facts of history in order to arrive at some foregone conclusion. The ancient Greeks told a fable about an ill-tempered giant, who stopped all travelers that came his way, and forced them to lie in his bed. This gentleman, Procrustes by name, had a disagreeable habit of fitting the customers to his bed; if a man was a few inches short, he stretched him until he extended from end to end; if

a man was a few inches longer than the bed, Procrustes cut off the feet or the head, until he attained a perfect fit. Just so the "time-setters" are continually doing violence to patent historical facts in order to fit them into their theory. Events that were of no particular importance are made the hinges upon which epochs turn,—as when a little sect is started in North Carolina, or when a Roman emperor pays a compliment to a Roman bishop. Exactness is the absolute law of chronology otherwise; a date is right or it is wrong; not so with the millennialist. He starts the Lutheran Reformation in 1518, if that date fits his theory better than 1517. "Pastor" Russell begins a very long and complicated string of calculations with the assertion that in 606 B. C., Zedekiah, the last king of the Jews, lost his crown. But this is not true; the event referred to occurred in 589. By adjusting the beginning of a period by the addition of a few years (666 for 663), or by subtracting a little at the end, the "figuring" can always be made to come out correctly.

A FAIR TEST.

If the reader is not yet convinced that this "time-setting" is at best a delusion, but in no sense deserves the consideration of thoughtful Christians, let him observe how readily the most preposterous notion can be proved by such use of the symbolical numbers of prophecy. I shall make the assertion that the Millennium is the period of the papacy. The "thousand years" in Rev. 20 denote, on this supposition, the period during which the Popes were to exercise their authority on earth. You say this is utterly foolish; the twentieth chapter in Revelation cannot be understood as a description of the rule of Antichrist, since it plainly speaks of the reign of Christ. However, by adopting the method of Mr. Williams, one can prove that the thousand years in Revelation, chapter twenty, mean just this and nothing else. Instead of taking, as our starting-point, some insignificant event in the history of the seventh century and calling it the beginning of the papacy, we shall go back

to the beginning of the fifth century, when the Mystery of Iniquity did actually take its rise in the Church Visible. We shall take the first seventeen years of that century, the years 400 to 417, the pontificate of Innocent I. What dates are here of special significance? Surely the year 412, when the Pope for the first time claimed "apostolic" power. Now, one thousand years later we find a great check to his "apostolic" power, for in the year 1412 John Hus declared that the Pope was Antichrist. We know what troubles for the papacy then followed. Again: In 415 for the first time both the Western and the Eastern bishops acknowledged a Roman bishop as the head of the Christian Church. One thousand years later, in 1415, the Western bishops, assembled in council at Constance, declared that the authority of the councils was above the Pope! Try again: In 418 the Pope for the first time asserted that all doctrinal questions must be decided by him; in 1418 we find a Pope, Martin V, drifting about helplessly because Rome was in the hands of his enemies. Or go back a few decades for our starting-point: The claim that the Popes have a primacy of all bishops was first openly made in 378, and this claim was acknowledged by a synod. Now, in 1378, just one thousand years after this claim was first publicly asserted, we find the papacy in her deepest degradation, for in that year commenced the schism, when Christianity had the spectacle of two, soon three, Popes cursing one another according to Hoyle. We conclude, then, that 1,000 is the number of the papacy, and not 1,260, as claimed by Mr. Williams. And we do not need to stretch the figures, either; they come out to the dot.

"But that is preposterous; the thousand years in Revelation stand for the reign of Christ, and not for the period of papal dominion." Why, certainly it is preposterous, and just this I am trying to demonstrate, — that according to the method applied by the "time-setters" any absurdity can be proved from the Sacred Scriptures. But lest any one say that our illustration (Millennium = Period of Antichrist) is too absurd to employ even for the purpose of argument, let me say that after these calculations were

made, a tract turned up which is based exactly upon this assumption that “a thousand years” (Rev. 20) is the number of the papacy. The tract is entitled, *No Millennium Future*, and the author is Eseck Wocott, Servant of Christ. Page 14 of this tract we read:—

“Just here an item of history will be of interest. The French Revolution gave opportunity for Napoleon Bonaparte, like Cyrus the Persian, a man of destiny, appointed of God to pour out some of his vials of wrath upon Romanism. At his assumption of the imperial crown in December, 1804, at Paris, the Pope made the journey across the Alps for the occasion. Instead of being crowned by the Pope or his legate, Napoleon put the crown upon his own head, and afterward crowned Josephine, who kneeled before him. Was this accidental? Not a word of it; but to show that an emperor ruled France who was not subject to the Church of Rome as was Charlemagne a thousand years before. A little more than a year after this he crowned himself again as king of Lombardy, of which the historian says: ‘After reposing a thousand years in the treasury of Monza, the iron crown of Charlemagne was brought forth to encircle the brow of Napoleon.’ (Alison, Vol. 2, p. 318.) Was all this accidental? Did the historian know he was unveiling the secret things of God? *These are some of God’s ways to instruct His servants.*

“The importance of this notable event consists in the fact that France was the ‘beast from the pit,’ and that Napoleon absolutely represented France even while First Consul.

“It may be difficult to fix upon a year in events of great magnitude as the French Revolution, still it must be evident to every one that 1792 and 3 are prominent for the ending of the thousand years of papal supremacy; then a writer on this subject finds from history the last revolt of the pagan Saxons was in 791, which was suppressed by Charlemagne the following year, thus distinctly locating the time the dragon was in the pit; then closely following and in keeping

with these events is the crowning of two distinguished actors in the drama, one thousand years apart, one elevating, the other abasing papacy.”

Here the ridiculous proposition that the Millennium is the Time of Papal Supremacy has been defended, no, triumphantly proved by one who calls himself “Servant of Christ,” and who asserts, after stating his conclusion: “From this there is no escape. The Holy Spirit of God never makes a mistake in the order of presenting its message.” There is something suspicious about the regularity with which these dates come out “right.” The simple explanation is this: The papacy had its rise between the fourth and seventh centuries; it had its decline between the fourteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Hence, wherever you commence in the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh centuries, you need but figure one thousand years or 1,260 (or 1,100, or 1,150, or 1,200 etc., etc.) years onward, and you are bound to strike some event in the later period which can, in a way, be termed a sign of decay. There is absolutely nothing mysterious about these figures; any number between 1,000 and 1,300 will serve as well as 1,260.

And so anything and everything can be proved by the “time-setters.” Dr. Shimeall taught that the date of the conversion of Cornelius by Peter was foretold in the Old Testament; a Russellite finds, by the same system, the beginning of Zionism, the rise of Socialism, and the end of the war, predicted by the holy prophets. Applying this to the matter at hand, we see that all the interpretations which seek to identify certain dates of the Great War, and of events which may follow upon its consummation, with certain statements of Scripture, are based upon *a system by means of which anything a person has a mind to prove can be proved*. In other words, all such interpretations of prophecy with reference to the war are utterly worthless. The system is a fraud and a delusion. Never has a single event been actually predicted (foretold, or announced in advance) by those who take the numbers of Daniel and the

Apocalypse in a mathematical sense. Not one Chiliast has predicted the capture of Jerusalem by the British, or the breakdown of Russia, or the entrance of the United States into the war.

IF GUESSES COME TRUE.

And let no one say: However, if the war should end in 1918, and if England should be defeated, and if Palestine is given to the Jews, then certain Chiliasts have reason to claim some merit for their system. Remember that these expectations, which appear as the result of calculation, are really the starting-point of the efforts to set the times, and give these efforts their direction. All these computations are so arranged as to fit the probable course which events will take. The reader may have said these months, as others have said: "I believe the war will be brought to an end by a universal famine." If that comes true, you and others will pride themselves upon having made a shrewd guess. But any connection which one might establish between this guess and some Scripture word of prophecy would not raise it above a guess, and if it came true, it would by no means follow that the connection with Scripture had been justifiable. So our Chiliasts may have guessed right when they say that Turkey will be dismembered, or that Socialism will rule the world within ten years, but it by no means follows that in that event their figuring of dates has been proved a correct use of the Bible. Why not? Solely because the same line of reasoning has led to contradictory and irrational conclusions? No, our main reason for rejecting all attempts to "set dates" by interpretation of prophecy is that the method itself is *without the least ground in Scripture*. If the method were right, there would be proof in the Bible itself that a "day" in prophecy denotes a "year." But for this assumption there is no ground in the Scriptures, as we shall now proceed to show.

DOES "DAY" MEAN "YEAR" IN PROPHECY?

III. That "day" stands for "year," hence "1,260 days" for 1,260 years, and "seventy weeks" for 70×7 years is the corner-stone of the system by means of which prophetic

dates are sought in the Scriptures for the present war. The burden of proof that "day" means "year" plainly rests upon those who make the claim. What proof do they furnish for the correctness of their method? They point to two texts from which it is believed that the equation "day" = "year" can be drawn. One of these texts is Ezek. 4, where the prophet is commanded to perform several symbolical acts, the acts standing for the penalties which Israel would receive for her guilt. For one thing, the prophet was commanded to lie upon his left side for a certain number of days, each day of his prostration denoting a year of Israel's abject condition. The other text is Num. 14, 33, 34, where it is said that the number of days which Joshua and Caleb were in Canaan is symbolical of the number of years which Israel was to remain in the wilderness. Upon the statement of the two passages just cited from Numbers and Ezekiel, and also upon supposed necessities of apocalyptic interpretation, a large number of modern writers on prophecy have advanced the theory that the word *day*, or *days*, is to be understood in prophetic designations of time as denoting years. This theory has been applied especially to the "time, times, and dividing of a time" in Dan. 7, 25, 12, 7, and Rev. 12, 14; the 1,260 days of Rev. 11, 3; 12, 6; and also by many to the 2,300 days of Dan. 8, 14 and the 1,290 and 1,335 days of Dan. 12, 11, 12. The forty and two months of Rev. 11, 2 and 13, 5 are, according to this theory, to be multiplied by thirty ($42 \times 30 = 1,260$), and then the result in days is to be understood as so many years. After the like manner the "time, times, and a half" are first understood as three years and a half, and then the years are multiplied by three hundred and sixty, a round number for the days of a year, and the result (1,260) is understood as designating, not so many days, but so many years.

If this is a correct theory of interpreting the designations of prophetic time, it is obvious that it is a most important one. On the strength of it Seventh-day Adventists, Russellites, and Campbellites announce that "The War has been Foretold!" Such a theory surely ought to be supported by

the most convincing and incontrovertible reasons. And yet, upon the most careful examination we do not find that it has any sufficient warrant in Scripture.

Dr. Milton S. Terry, of Garrett Biblical Institute, in his *Biblical Hermeneutics*, which is in great part devoted to the study of prophecy, urges the following reasons against the validity of the "day-year" theory:—

"1) This theory derives no valid support from the passages in Numbers and Ezekiel (already referred to). In Num. 14, 33, 34 Jehovah's word to Israel simply states that they must suffer for their iniquities forty years, 'in the number of the days which ye searched the land, forty days, a day for the year.' There is no possibility of misunderstanding this. The spies were absent forty days searching the land of Canaan (Num. 13, 25), and when they returned, they brought back a bad report of the country, and spread disaffection, murmuring, and rebellion through the whole congregation of Israel (14, 2—4). Thereupon the divine sentence of judgment was pronounced upon that generation, and they were condemned to 'graze in the wilderness forty years' (14, 33). Here, then, is certainly no ground on which to base the universal proposition that, in prophetic designations of time, a day means a year. The passage is exceptional and explicit, and the words are used in a strictly literal sense; the days evidently mean days, and the years mean years. The same is true in every particular of the days and years mentioned in Ezek. 4, 5, 6. The days of his prostration were literal days, and they were typical of years, as is explicitly stated. But to derive from this symbolico-typical action of Ezekiel a principle of interpretation or universal law, namely, that days in prophecy mean years, would be a most unwarrantable procedure.

"2) If the two passages now noticed were expressive of a universal law, we certainly would expect to find it sustained and capable of illustration by examples of fulfilled prophecy. But examples bearing on this point are overwhelmingly against the theory in question. God's Word to Noah was: 'Yet seven days, I will cause it to rain upon the land forty

days and forty nights' (Gen. 7, 4). This was a prophecy. But did any one ever imagine these days were symbolical of years? God's word to Abraham was that his seed should be afflicted in a foreign land four hundred years (Gen. 15, 13). Must we multiply these years by three hundred and sixty to know the real time intended? Isaiah prophesied that Ephraim should be broken within sixty-five years (Is. 7, 8); but who ever dreamed that this must be resolved into days in order to find the period of Ephraim's fall? Was it ever sagely believed that the three years of Moab's glory, referred to in Is. 16, 14, must be multiplied by three hundred and sixty in order to find the import of what Jehovah had spoken concerning it? Was it by such mathematical calculations as this that Daniel 'understood in the books the number of years, which was a word of Jehovah to Jeremiah (comp. Jer. 25, 12) the prophet, to complete as to the desolations of Jerusalem seventy years' (Dan. 9, 2)?³³ In short, this theory breaks down utterly when an appeal is taken to the analogy of prophetic Scriptures. If in one prophecy of the future, twelve hundred and sixty days must, without accompanying qualification or any statement to that effect in the context, be understood as denoting so many years, then the advocates of such a theory must show pertinent and valid reason why the forty days of Jonah's prophecy against Nineveh (Jonah 3, 4) are not to be also understood as denoting forty years.

3) "It has been argued that in such passages as Judg. 17, 10; 1 Sam. 2, 19; 2 Chron. 21, 19; and Is. 32, 10, the word days is used to denote years, and 'if this word be sometimes thus used in Scripture in places not prophetic, why should it not thus be employed in prophetic passages?' But a critical examination of those passages will show that the word for days is not really used in the sense of years. In Judg. 17, 10, Micah says to the Levite: 'Dwell with me, and be to me for a father and a priest, and

33) In other words, the seventy years of Israel's captivity in Babylon were foretold as "years," not as "days."

I will give thee ten [pieces] of silver for the days,' that is, for the days that he should dwell with him as a priest. In 1 Sam. 2, 19 it is said that Samuel's mother 'made him a little robe, and brought it up to him from days to days in her going up along with her husband to offer the sacrifice of the days.' Here the reference is to the particular days of going up to the tabernacle to worship and sacrifice, and the exact sense is not brought out by the common version, 'year by year' or 'yearly.' They may have gone up several times during the year at the days of the great national feasts. And this appears from a comparison of 1 Sam. 1, 3 and 7, where, in the first place, it is said that Elkanah went up from days to days, and in verse 7: 'So he did year by year.' That is, he went up three times a year according to the law (Ex. 23, 14—17), 'from days to days,' as the well-known national feast-days came around; and his wife generally accompanied him. 2 Chron. 21, 19 is literally: 'And it came to pass at days from days' (*i. e.*, after several days), 'and the time of going out [expiration] of the end, at two days his bowels went out,' etc. Similarly, Is. 32, 10: 'Days above a year shall ye be troubled,' etc. That is, more than a year shall ye be troubled. The most that can be said of such a use of the word days is, that it is used indefinitely in a proverbial and idiomatic way; but such a usage by no means justifies the broad proposition that a day means a year.

4) "The advocates of the year-day theory rest their strongest argument, however, upon the necessity of such a theory for what they regard the true explanation of certain prophecies. They affirm that the three times and a half of Dan. 7, 25, and the 1,260 days of Rev. 12, 6 and their parallels, are incapable of a literal interpretation. And so, carrying the predictions both of Daniel and John down into the history of modern Europe for explanation, most of these writers understand the 1,260 year-days as designating the period of the Roman papacy. Mr. William Miller, famous in the last generation for the sensation he produced, and the large following he had, adopted a scheme of interpreting not only

the 1,260 days, but also the 1,290 and the 1,335 (of Dan. 12, 11. 12), so that he ascertained and published with great assurance that the coming of Christ would take place in October, 1843. We have lived to see his theories thoroughly exploded, and yet there have not been wanting others who have adopted his hermeneutical principles, and named A. D. 1866 and A. D. 1870 as 'the time of the end.' A theory which is so destitute of Scriptural analogy and support, as we have seen above, and presumes to rest on such a slender showing of divine authority, is alone on those grounds to be suspected; but when it has again and again proved to be false and misleading in its application, we may safely reject it, as furnishing no valid principle or rule in a true science of hermeneutics. Those who have supposed it to be necessary for the exposition of prophecies should begin to feel that their systems of interpretation are in error.

"The duration of the thousand years, or the millennial reign, mentioned in Rev. 20, 2—7, has been variously estimated. Most of those who advocate the year-day theory have singularly agreed to understand *this* thousand years *literally*. With them days mean years, and times mean years, to be resolved into 360 days each; *but the thousand years of the Apocalypse are literally and exactly a thousand years!* Many, however, understand this number as denoting an indefinitely long period, and some have not scrupled to apply to it the theory of a day for a year, and, multiplying by three hundred and sixty, estimate the length of the Millennium at three hundred and sixty thousand years! But in this case we have no analogy, no real parallel, in other parts of Scripture. Allen himself candidly admits that 'there is nothing in the customary use of the phrase a thousand, in other places, which will determine its import in the Book of Revelation. The probability of its being used there definitely or indefinitely must be determined by examining the place itself, and from the nature of the case.' This is a very safe and proper rule, and it may be added that, as we have found the number ten to symbolize the general idea of fullness, totality, completeness, so not improbably the number

one thousand may stand as the symbolic number of manifold fulness, the rounded aeon of Messianic triumph, and bring in the 'fulness' of both Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 12, 12. 25)."

The cogency of Dr. Terry's argument cannot, I think, be successfully assailed. There is no warrant in Scripture for interpreting the symbolical numbers (1,260 days, etc.) as signifying years. If this support, however, be withdrawn from the argument of those who assert that there are specific references to the Great War in the Scriptures, then it is evident that the argument, for lack of evidence, falls to the ground.

Hence we conclude:—

Because the method of interpretation employed leads to contradictory results;

Because this method of reading prophecy has failed in the past whenever predictions have been based upon it;

Because only by misstating historical facts (1518 for 1517, 666 for 663, etc.) even a semblance of fulfilment can be asserted with reference to past history;

Because there is an utter absence of Scriptural warrant for this method of interpreting prophecy;—

Therefore the "days" and "years" of prophecy do not support the claim of the Chiliasts that THE WAR HAS BEEN FORETOLD.

Chapter 6. — How to Read Prophecy.

Chiliasm is a kind of religious disease. The reader cannot fail to have observed, as we picked our way through the millennial jungle that has grown up about the war, that there is an evident derangement of judgment especially among the "time-setting" fraternity. "Crack-brained" is what one is tempted to call their way of reasoning on the war in its relation to the "days" of prophecy. However, we observe that there are various degrees in the influence which this delusion asserts over the various minds. There are Chiliasts who retain their spiritual balance, inasmuch as they still believe that the great, central doctrine of Chris-

tianity is the article of Justification by Faith. Not every chiliastic misinterpreter of prophecy may be as sound in his Christian belief as was the Chiliast Bengel in the eighteenth century; yet there are those among them to-day who are no doubt sincere believers. In the booklet on *Gog and His Defeat* we find only scattered references to the Millennium. No matter how far the author may have erred in his interpretation of Ezek. 38, it does not seem that the millennial heresy has obtained a hold upon his inner life. The author's racial sympathies, prior to the entrance of the United States into the war, seem to have temporarily affected his clearness of spiritual vision. Others are real Chiliasts, false teachers, errorists, against whom Christians must be specifically warned, lest they be led astray. Such men are Drs. Gray and Gaebelien. However, no one who knows the record of these men and their strong stand over against the infidel critics of the Bible, will doubt their Christian sincerity. Both these men stand for the great essentials of our faith. But does the doctrine of the Millennium become Scriptural because some pious men have taught it? Surely not. Nor is it a matter of indifference whether a Christian, even if he is sound in his religious faith otherwise, holds to erroneous views concerning the Second Advent. Scripture demands assent to all her teachings, not only to the so-called fundamentals. *Every error bears in itself the seeds of unbelief and apostasy.*

Moreover, there is sufficient evidence at hand to prove the particularly insidious character of the perils which lurk in Chiliasm. It is, above all, the *method of interpreting the Scriptures* adopted by Chiliasts, especially by the "time-setting" variety, which is apt to lead people away from the very fundamentals of faith. The methods of interpretation employed in the treatises which we have reviewed, consistently applied, leave nothing of the Scriptures but a jumble of symbols, which each man may interpret to suit his fancy, or, let us rather say, to suit his Old Adam. If it were not for this danger, the present volume would not have been written. The manner of handling God's inspired

Word customary among those whom we have quoted on the war prepares the soil of the mind for the soul-destroying heresy of "Pastor" Russell, or of Christian Science, or of Adventism, or some other form of fake Christianity. Any one who adopts this manner of reading prophecy has accepted a principle which will ultimately, if adhered to, destroy his soul in hell. Surely, the paramount question must be: What is the *fundamental error* of the Chiliastic method of interpreting Scripture? Unless this is clearly apprehended, there is an ever-present danger that the eye of faith will be blinded by the poison-gas of millenarian literature. How shall we retain our vision clear?

BIBLE WORDS ARE MEANT AS THEY READ.

1) All sound interpretation rests upon the principle that the Bible was written to be understood. Every method of interpreting the Scriptures which proceeds on the notion that the inspired Word of God is of the nature of a puzzle to exercise the ingenuity of the reader, is fundamentally wrong. The utmost confusion must result as soon as we depart from the principle that the words of Scripture are intended to be understood in the sense which those words usually have in human language. Any departure from that simple, literal sense must be admitted only when clearly demanded by the text, or when the literal sense would be contrary to the general teachings of Scripture. The sacred text itself, not the interpreter, must decide whether words are intended to be taken in their original, every-day meaning, or whether they have a figurative meaning. And when we find a difficult passage, in which the meaning of certain words is not clear from the connection in which they stand, then we must obtain light upon such passages, not from the opinions of men, but from the clear, unmistakable passages in which the inspired writers treat the same subject.

To illustrate. The second chapter of the Bible states that in Eden there were four streams. Since there is nothing in this passage to lead us to believe that "stream" or "river" here means anything else than "river," in the ordinary

sense of the term, and since there is no text in the Bible which tells us that "river" is here not used in its ordinary sense, it would be wrong to say, as was taught by some Jewish interpreters, that "river" here stands for virtues, and that the sense of the passage is that the four "cardinal virtues," prudence, temperance, courage, and justice, proceed from the Creator. When Moses prohibited the eating of the flesh of the swine, the eagle, and the hawk, Jewish interpreters made the comment: "The sow is the emblem of unclean lust for food; the eagle indicates robbery; the hawk, injustice; the raven, greed," etc. Now, this precisely is the method of our "time-setters" when they predict the events which are to come after the war. Russellism is based on just such interpretation. But adopt the system of reading prophecy employed by Russellism, and where does the process land you? Let us see.

Commenting on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Mr. Russell said:³⁴⁾ "Lazarus, the poor beggar, symbolizes those Gentiles who were outside the Jewish covenant. The dogs which licked Lazarus' sores represent Gentiles in general. The rich man, the Jewish nation, took sick, and gradually died to all of the privileges and blessings which had been theirs. The appeal of the rich man to Abraham to cool his tongue was fulfilled when the Jews of this country, by a general petition, requested the President of the United States to intercede in their behalf in Russia that they might have less persecution." Russell adds: "This interpretation *relieves our mind greatly*," — yes, and thousands have said, "For this relief much thanks"; for it explains away one of the clearest texts that teach the reality of hell as a place of eternal torment. Russell taught that there is no hell. Many people feel relieved when they are told that there is no hell. By just such methods of reading the Bible, Russellism also arrives at the conclusion that there will be no Judgment Day. All descriptions of the Day of Doom are taken in a symbolical sense. Luke 21, 26: "The powers of heaven shall be shaken," is explained to mean that the "ecclesiastical systems" (the

34) *Bible Study Monthly*, I, 4.

beliefs of Christendom) will be shaken by Russellism. Matt. 24, 29: "The sun shall be darkened, the moon will not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven," is explained³⁵⁾ symbolically. The sun is the Gospel, the moon is the Mosaic Law, the stars are the teachers of Christendom. All the antichristian teachings of Russellism are sustained by just such methods of reading into clear texts a symbolical meaning. 1 Cor. 15, 50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," is made to signify that Jesus did not enter heaven with His human body, but in a gaseous or spirit form, and this is called "the second birth of Christ"! As such, says Russell, He appeared to His disciples seven times in forty *years* ("day" = "year").

Every reference to the present war which Russellites find in Holy Writ is found by a process of reasoning based on the same cardinal error of interpretation. One Russellite sends me a letter (November, 1914) from Brooklyn in which he points out the fulfilment of 1 Kings 19, 11, thus: A great wind came = World War; an earthquake = social revolution; fire = anarchy; and then a still small voice, the voice of Jehovah establishing the Millennium! This, of course, is madness. But "there is method in this madness." Luke 21, 11: "And great earthquakes shall be in diverse places," is interpreted as a prediction of great revolutions which are to follow the European war. Joel 2, 30: "Blood and fire and pillars of smoke," is "being fulfilled in the Great War." We read Ezek. 7, 19: "They shall cast their silver in the streets"; so anxious will the flight of Israel be when the enemies pursue them. What does Russell make of it? A prophecy of the gold standard of modern nations, which has demonetized silver!!³⁶⁾ In the same sermon he quoted

35) *Old Theology Quarterly*, January, 1908.

36) Sermon, November 15, 1914. By this same method we can prove that the war-bread in use in Germany was foretold by Ezekiel. Read Ezek. 4, 9. A Swiss paper points out the coincidence that the "war-bread" of 580 B. C. almost exactly corresponds in ingredients to the war-bread of 1917. Now, if the Swiss journalist had been a Russellite, — but you can imagine the rest.

Job 5, 13: "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness," and pointed out the fulfilment: "The great banks had filled their vaults with securities before the war, which they cannot now sell at any price." This may seem the harmless ravings of a religious crank, but they lead the hearer who accepts them to accept also in the same sermon this blasphemy: "Christ has not yet had a kingdom on earth; if He did, He would be responsible for the wars, persecutions, famines, and pestilences which have happened during the past 1800 years." Thus, by degrees, the hearer is led to accept the doctrine that Christ's reign on earth began in 1914.

The reader cannot fail to see the point. If you accept the Russellite statements regarding the war, you must, by the same method of reading the Scriptures, accept his false doctrines regarding the person of the Redeemer and His work. Thousands accept the deadly errors of Russellism because they see no escape from this conclusion. And this applies to Seventh-day Adventism with equal force. By the same kind of arbitrary interpretation the Christian Scientists teach that the verse Gen. 2, 6, has this meaning: "A *mist* arose," that is to say, a *mistake* arose: man commenced to believe that he had a body (Eddyism denies that man has a body). Arbitrarily take words in a figurative sense, which by their connection in the sacred text are to be understood literally, and you can prove anything from the Bible. Russellite and Adventist teaching regarding the war is the broad and easy parkway which leads Christians into the Synagog of Satan.

Conversely, since the system of interpreting Scripture adopted by these false prophets leads to blasphemous denial of the saving truths of Christianity, and subverts the foundation of Christian faith and hope, therefore we reject all interpretations of prophecy with reference to the war so prominent in Campbellite, Russellite, and Adventist literature, as wholly arbitrary, unwarranted, and without foundation in the Scriptures.

FIGURES AND SYMBOLS.

2) But it is likewise a mistake to cling to the literal meaning when the text itself evidently suggests a figurative or symbolical meaning, or if the literal meaning would result in doctrine contrary to that which the Bible elsewhere clearly teaches. There is indeed figurative language in the Scriptures. There are types and symbols, figures and parables. When our Savior called King Herod a "fox," He was using a figure of speech; Herod in craftiness resembled a fox. To take the word in its literal sense is forbidden by the connection in which it stands. Similarly, false prophets are called "wolves." Christ refers to the Pharisaic "leaven," and then explained that He meant the false teachings of the Pharisees. Observe that we do not *arbitrarily* arrive at the conclusion that "fox," "wolf," "leaven," are used figuratively, in an applied meaning. Any reader of the Scriptures will perceive that in the texts in which they occur they simply cannot be understood literally. Again, the prophets are called to preach "unto Zion." No one understands or has ever understood this to refer to the actual rock Zion on which David's castle was built. No, Zion stands for the city of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem, again, for the chosen people, the Jews. Zion, Jerusalem, are thus used hundreds of times in the Scriptures. On this all Bible-readers are agreed. Without doubt, there is figurative language in the Bible. And if, on the one hand, we are not arbitrarily to assume a *figurative* sense where the literal sense is sufficient and in harmony with the rest of the Bible, where it speaks on the same matters, so we are not to interpret a passage *literally* where the text evidently speaks in imagery, or where the literal sense would not harmonize with clear Biblical teaching. There are many, indeed, there is an abundance of clear texts, where the truths of revelation are specifically treated, and where there can be no misunderstanding if we are satisfied to take the words simply as they stand. These clear texts are the touchstone by which the meaning of the more difficult passages is to be established. In Rev. 20 there is something said about a first and a second "*resurrection*."

Now, the Bible says elsewhere, in texts which we have already quoted, that there is but one resurrection; the good and the wicked will all be raised on the last day. Hence it is clear that "resurrection" is used in Rev. 20 in a figurative sense. As elsewhere in the New Testament, the conversion of a sinner to his God is here called a "resurrection," a coming to life; he that was dead in sins is now alive spiritually. The same chapter makes reference to a "*thousand years*." Now, to accept that literally, and to say that before Judgment Day Christ will reign with His saints ten centuries on earth, would involve us in a contradiction with our Savior's unmistakably clear statement that no man will know when He will return to Judgment; according to Chiliasts the believers would know the day one thousand years in advance. Hence, we accept "thousand years" as signifying "a long time" (the Gospel-age), just as we are accustomed to say, "I would go a thousand miles to hear him," or, "I have told you a hundred times," etc. The Savior did not mean to say that we shall forgive our brother 490 times when He said "seven times seventy." If 490 is used figuratively, then why not 1000?

And here just one more word as to symbolical numbers. It is very clear that, aside from their strict arithmetical values, numbers are used in the Bible in a symbolical manner. The most superficial reading of the Scriptures reveals the fact that such numbers as seven, ten, twelve, forty, seventy, possess some mystical significations, both in the Old and New Testaments. The Passover feast continued seven days, the blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled seven times before the Lord, the sacramental cleansings required sevenfold sprinklings. Every seventh day is a Sabbath, every seventh year a Sabbatical Year. Hence seven has been called the sacred number of the Covenant between God and His people. Ten virgins go forth to meet the bridegroom in the parable, the Law of God is spoken of as the ten words. Ten completes the list of primary numbers, and is naturally regarded as the number of rounded fulness or completeness. Numbers are also used in an indefinite sense. Ten times is equivalent

to many times, Job 19, 3; ten sons means many sons, 1 Sam. 1, 8; ten mighty ones are many mighty ones, Eccl. 7, 19. Like ten, the number seven is sometimes used indefinitely in the sense of many, Ps. 12, 6; Prov. 26, 16.

The "time and times and dividing of a time" in Daniel and Revelation is commonly and with reason believed to stand for three years and a half, a "time" denoting a year, cf. Rev. 12, 6. 12, where 1,260 days, or three and a half years, reckoning 360 days to a year, are the equivalent of this period. But as this number is in every case used to denote a period of woe and disaster to the Church or people of God (cf. Rev. 11, 2), we may properly regard it as symbolical. It is a divided seven, as if suggesting the thought of a broken covenant (seven being the covenant number), an interrupted sacrifice, a triumph of the enemy of God. This conclusion is generally accepted by ripe Christian scholarship, while the substitution of "years" for "days," as a basis for chronological calculations, is the stock-in-trade of errorists and fanatics.

THE SCOPE OF PROPHECY.

3) The writer has gone somewhat beyond the original scope of his treatise. His original task had been to examine the claims which have been made with such great assurance: **IT HAS BEEN FORETOLD.** Having found every such claim lacking in Scriptural warrant, he might have presented the evidence in a few dozen pages, this all the more, since by far the greatest number of those who have found the war prophesied in Scripture are Chiliasts, and the argument of Scripture against Chiliasm, which automatically disposes of most of these claims, can be summarized on a few pages. However, our subject has necessarily led us into a somewhat full discussion of the more important texts usually appealed to, and of sound principles of interpretation generally. Farther than this we cannot go within the compass of this treatise. However, the reader who has studied and well understands the Great Books of the Bible,—the Psalms and the historical books of the Old Testament, and the Gospels and such epistles as Romans, Galatians, the two

Corinthians, and Ephesians in the New, — I say, readers who have attained to a good knowledge of that which these *clear* books of Scripture teach, sometimes feel a desire also to study the difficult portions, such as the prophecies of the Old Testament. Nor can it be doubted that Bible students who are well grounded in the articles of Christian faith will derive much instruction, comfort, and new impulses to holiness also from the reading of the prophetical writings. A few simple observations may be of help to such devout students of prophecy.

In reading the prophets, we observe, by a strict application of what has been said in this chapter about literal and figurative sense, that

The Bible knows only of two ages: the age of Old Testament expectation, in which men looked forward to the advent of the Redeemer in the flesh, and the age of New Testament expectation, in which men look forward to the second advent of the Redeemer, in glory. The first age was the time from the creation of the world to the birth of Christ; the second age lasts from thence onward to the Day of Judgment. Beyond that there is ETERNITY.

Prophecy concerns only the Kingdom of God. Prophecy indeed makes reference to the monarchies which rose and fell in the centuries before Christ was born. This was for the purpose that, when He should come, men would recognize in Jesus the promised Messiah. 1 Pet. 1, 10—12. Bible history does not report anything about the nations outside of the chosen race, except in so far as they affected the fortunes of Israel. Only in their relation to Israel, the people of God, are the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Hittites, etc., mentioned. Just so in prophecy. That which was not related to the Kingdom of God was not the subject of prophecy. Apply this to the predictions concerning the New Testament age. The last reference to purely secular monarchies occurs where, in Daniel and Revelation, the break-up of the Roman Empire into ten states is spoken of. And why? Because, even as the succession of ancient world-empires pointed to the time when *Christ* was to come, and certified Him as the Redeemer when

He came, so the condition of the world after the fall of the last monarchy, the Roman, was described in order to establish the time when *Antichrist* should come, and help Christians identify him after he had come. Now, Antichrist is so clearly described, for instance, in verses 36—39 of Dan. 11, and also in Dan. 7, 25; 9, 27; 12, 7. 11; 2 Thess. 2, 3. 4; 1 Tim. 4, 1—3; Rev. 11, 2. 3; 12, 6. 14, that we may with great assurance identify him with the Pope. Beyond this the Bible does not appear to take any regard for human history in the New Testament age or the rise of kingdoms and empires. They are of interest only so far as they affect the destiny of the Church visible. That the Turk should be referred to³⁷⁾ might be expected for this very reason, because it was the last effort, from the outside, to destroy the Christian Church. But prophecy is silent concerning specific events after the papacy was shorn of her power through the Lutheran Reformation, Rev. 14, 6—8. So far as we can see, prophecy makes no divisions except this one in the last age: the rise of Antichrist and his downfall through the Reformation. Only by a forced and unnatural, arbitrary way of treating the sacred text can we establish from prophecy landmarks in the history of the Church after the Reformation. For this reason, too (because prophecy treats temporal affairs only in their relation to Christ's kingdom), the prophets are silent regarding purely secular history after the rise of the papacy. Since the Popes began to rule Church and State, secular government could no longer affect in any decisive way the destiny of visible Christianity. And now there is no longer any new development to which we are to look forward in the history of the Church on earth. There is but a season of waiting for the return of Christ in glory. Then the enemies, the spiritual (Antichrist) and the carnal (Gog and Magog and his unclean tribe), will be slain in a universal crash not only of empires, but of visible nature and of the very elements.

37) Luther's opinion concerning Gog and Magog has been alluded to.

After that great Armageddon, when all things will be put under the feet of Jesus Christ, there will be — eternity.

From this scope of prophecy we may also derive a hint *why the Great War*, in spite of its stupendous significance to the world, *does not appear in prophecy*. The war has involved almost the entire civilized world, there have been naval battles on the seven seas, and for three years and a half millions of fighters are locked in death-grapple upon three continents. From every part of the globe men are drawn into this maelstrom of blood. But in spite of its universal character the Church of Christ has no interests at stake in the outcome of this struggle. It is a war in which religion has played hardly any figure. The Christian Church is not involved. Nor has Antichrist been able to influence the fortunes of any belligerent. Christian missions have locally suffered loss, but there has been no dropping away from the Church generally on account of the war, nor, on the other hand, has there been a noticeable or permanent renewal of interest in Church-work. The Church is detached from the war and its varying aspects. Countless Protestants, Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, and Mohammedans are fighting on each side. There has been no persecution of the visible Church, or any part of it, as such. When the war is over, no doubt there will be certain influences for good and others for evil as a legacy of the colossal struggle, but it does not appear that the status of the Church as such can be changed the least, for better or worse, by the event. The war, no doubt, has religious meaning — it is a punishment for the rejection of the Gospel in all Christian lands; it is one of the great catastrophes which during the Gospel-age are to direct the hearts of Christians to look forward to the return of their Master; it is a revelation of that wickedness and malice of the natural heart which is so often denied by unbelievers, but which now stands forth in all its hideousness. There are many lessons to be drawn from the war, and the manner in which it is conducted. But the life of the Church has not been touched by it. The siege of Jerusalem by Titus and the consequent events have had a vastly

greater influence even on the outward fortunes of Christianity than this great conflict. In the wars of Mohammed and his successors there was a definite purpose to destroy Christianity. The Thirty Years' War had still some special religious significance. But neither this last attempt of Antichrist to regain his lost provinces by means of the sword, nor, in a later age, that amazing display of wickedness, misery, and folly which we call the French Revolution, nor the terrible Napoleonic wars which followed it, marked an epoch in the history of the Church; hence prophecy is silent concerning these great events. The Christian Church fought her last decisive battle in Luther's day. In the present conflict she is a spectator, horrified, repentant, but not a participant, except as an agent of mercy; nor is Christian Truth at stake. And this may be regarded as an explanation of the fact that, in spite of its significance to human society at large, the World War has not, so far as we can see in the light which we now have, been foretold in prophecy.





3 6655 00052471 1

BS647 .G67

Graebner, Theodore./Prophecy a

BS 647 .G67
Graebner, Theodore,
1876-1950.
Prophecy and the war

BS 647 .G67
Graebner, Theodore,
1876-1950.
Prophecy and the war

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

Concordia College Library
Bronxville, NY 10708



S0-EHD-871

